

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, February, 1902.

THE USE OF EPISODE IN THE TEACHING OF FICTION.

WITHIN the last decade the study of narrative fiction has won its way to an assured place in the English work of our schools and colleges. Instructors have come to recognize not only the especial force and value of ethical teaching when carried in the story-form, but the chance for original thought which is offered by the technical analysis of great novels. The very keenest interest can be aroused in students by the discovery of æsthetic principles in narratives hitherto thought of simply as narratives. In conducting my course in Fiction Analysis in this University I have devoted almost my entire attention to this aspect of narrative, and have applied to a number of English novels the sort of tests usually applied to Shakspeare's plays, for instance, when their dramatic construction is under discussion. Such points would be the plot outline, the character grouping, the expression of theme, the function of characters, the reason for each episode, the method of character-presentation, the position and value of pause, the use of retard, contrast, and restraint, the distribution of monologue, dialogue, and group-scenes, the intermixture of dramatic, epic, and lyric in the presentation of the story,—and so on. A pamphlet of questions drawn up by me on such lines, and published by our University Press, is used by my classes. The novels thus analyzed are, at present, *Emma*, *Guy Mannering*, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, *Vanity Fair*, *Adam Bede*, *House of the Seven Gables*, *Put Yourself in His Place*, *The Egoist*, *Tess of the D'Urbervilles*. A twelve-weeks' course is occupied in the discussions, of which the first two weeks are given up to lectures on the development of English narrative; during this time the class is supposed to get fairly started in the reading necessary for the course. Thereafter one novel is discussed each week, the work on each closing with a lecture by the instructor, on that author. The class is also required to write weekly papers, beginning with the third

novel studied, when some degree of familiarity with technical analysis has been gained. These papers are, at present, on the following topics:—The American Episode in *Martin Chuzzlewit*,—The Brussels Episode in *Vanity Fair*,—The Coming-of-Age Celebration in *Adam Bede*,—The chapter entitled "The Flight of Two Owls," in the *House of Seven Gables*,—A comparative study of these four episodes,—The Creation of a Central Figure in *Emma* and in *The Egoist*, compared,—The Treatment of Subordinate Figures and of Background in *Adam Bede* and in *Tess*, compared.

Any teacher will observe the gradual increase of difficulty in this series of problems; but no teacher who has not attempted to conduct such analysis with a class can realize the value of the first four subjects, and the way in which each selection so epitomizes the peculiarities of its author as to permit of generalizations and comparisons theoretically impossible on so limited a basis. Take, for example, the five chapters, 28 to 33, of *Vanity Fair*.

Like the American Episode in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, the Waterloo episode is a sudden and great enlargement of the background. By Dickens a new country is opened before the reader, by Thackeray the events and issues of world-history are drawn into the story. Observe, however, the different treatment by the two authors of this enlarged scene. Dickens loses sight of his main purpose and diverges to satirize the follies and vices of American society; Thackeray does not permit the thought of even Napoleon or Wellington to tempt him from his chosen path. Near as is the field of Waterloo, we see and hear it only at a very few moments. Its presence and its pressure are constantly felt, but are recognized by us through the emotions we see excited in the group of characters we are watching. Twice we see the dismay caused by the sound of cannon coming from the unseen struggle; between these two waves of fear comes the wounded ensign's report of the earlier encounter; and twice the curtain goes up to show to us a single figure on the field,—first Rawdon wrapped in his cloak under the rain, and then after a brief description of the

Guard's last charge, the single dead figure of George, lying on his face with a bullet through his heart.

From one point of view, the episode exists mainly to accomplish this last-named fact,—the removal of George Osborne from the story. So with Dickens' episode, its plot-purpose was the effecting of one thing, the change in Martin's nature. But in Dickens' case not only was that change effected abruptly, crudely, forcibly as it were, but nothing else was done for plot or theme or main characters; on the contrary, we were distracted by a panorama of new characters unrelated to the story, who eventually disappear with the suddenness of a Harlequin.

With Thackeray all is different. First, the transition to Brussels is natural and expected; all the main characters are here, and our attention is centred unwaveringly on them, with no sudden changes to England. Again, the relation of the Brussels episode to the Becky plot is as distinct as its relation to the Amelia-George-Dobbin plot. Here Becky first finds real scope for her social and dramatic powers. The affair with Lady Bareacres preludes her later struggles with her own sex; General Tufto is the forerunner of the Marquis of Steyne; and the success of Becky at the Duchess of Richmond's ball heralds the theatricals at Gaunt House. The Brussels episode is a link in the chain of Becky's social successes and failures,—Russell Square, Queen's Crawley, Brighton, Brussels, Paris, Curzon Street, Gaunt House,—and each episode is an integral part of the plot, picaresque though the succession of episodes may be. With Dickens we can trace episode within episode; for example, the Elijah Pogram levee within the American Episode; and in the smaller case as in the larger there is a total lack of correlation of episode to theme and plot of the main story. In Thackeray, however, look at a bit like the dinner which George gives the Earl of Bareacres' family. Small though its scale is, episode within episode though it is, it not only illuminates the character of George and the weak devotion of his wife, but it is made a part of the plot in that it shows how the Osbornes got their invitation to the Richmond ball, where the entanglement of George with

Becky becomes serious, and it echoes the keynote of the book,—the vanity of human wishes.

Indeed, the whole Brussels episode not only advances plot, but even more markedly illuminates character and theme. Waterloo and Napoleon are utilized by the novelist to bring the tremendous pressure of fear on to the personages of *Vanity Fair*, and "turn upon them the searchlight of great events." The moment at which Thackeray chooses to show us the inmost heart of his men and women is a moment at which the destiny of empires is in the balance. Yet of that destiny he does not choose that we shall think; we are to see only his little circle of characters. This use of the great to illuminate the less is markedly Thackerayan. When he says: "Napoleon landed at Cannes, and the funds fell, and old John Sedley was ruined,"—this is not an anticlimax, it is the normal movement of Thackeray's thought, which is centred always on the poor little, peeping, anxious, human face behind the mask of dignities and ceremonies and sounding events. Thus Waterloo is not for him the Waterloo that appeared to Victor Hugo; it is the fire by which to test his characters. He uses the great world-event not only to emphasize the main note in each personage,—Becky's heartless egoism, Amelia's absorbed devotion, Jos's cowardice,—but also to bring out the possibilities of other traits. Mrs. O'Dowd is brave and unselfish; the most commonplace and absurd of the three women becomes a heroic and generous figure standing between two extreme types of selfish courage, Amelia and Becky; Amelia flashes out once in unexpected spirit; Becky is, for one of the few times in her life, "touched in spite of herself;" and Rawdon shows for the first time those qualities that are later to bring him up in our sympathetic esteem. Thackeray here as elsewhere loves to touch on the contrast between the outward appearance or character and the inward feeling. As he has elsewhere said of Becky that an unexpected kindness "brought tears into the eyes of our resolute little adventuress," so he here says of Rawdon:

"And this famous dandy of Windsor and Hyde Park went off on his campaign with a kit as modest as that of a sergeant, and with

something like a prayer on his lips for the woman he was leaving."

Contrast, in character and in situation, is everywhere in these chapters, done by touches or *in extenso*. Thus, when the wounded ensign tells his story, it was George who cut down the French lancer that speared the boy, but it was Dobbin who, though wounded himself, carried the lad in his arms to a cart bound for Brussels, and promised the driver two louis if he would find out Mrs. George Osborne's hotel and tell her that her husband was unhurt and well. We see Rawdon, bivouacking under the rain and thinking with all the force of his heart of the little wife he had left behind him, while she, having counted her valuables and felt sure of looking her widow's weeds steadily in the face, is asleep dreaming of perhaps becoming Mme. la Maréchale in the event of French victory. Earlier, there were the three partings; Mrs. O'Dowd's practical wifeliness contrasted with Amelia's helpless agony and with Becky's calculating heartlessness. And there are also contrasts on a larger scale; the comedy action of Jos' cowardice is before our eyes while the tragedy of other men's bravery is going on out of sight. Situations are contrasted,—George's shame as he looks at his innocent wife and thinks of his folly a few hours before, Amelia's temporary triumph over Becky with the defeat of the night just past,—and many others. Lastly, when the episode closes with Amelia on her knees praying for George, and the curtain rises to show us his dead figure even while she prays, we remember a ball and a bouquet, and feel that the great artist who wrote this story within a story never for one moment forgot his theme,—the Vanity of Human Wishes,—never forgot the eternal contrast between our immortality and our mortality.

The same unity of total impression, every detail made "eloquent of one idea," as Stevenson says, gives *Adam Bede* the first place among George Eliot's works. In studying the episode chosen from *Adam Bede*, the class is at first puzzled by the great length at which minor events and background characters are presented; the plot scarcely moves, and no further development of the principal personages takes place. But a closer examination

shows the function of these chapters in the plot,—an emphasizing summary of all the happy past, a pause just before the climax, an ominous stillness before the storm breaks; and all the more tragic in its lightheartedness, all the more ominous in its calm because of the optimism of the unsuspecting group on which the blow is to fall. The whole episode is a study in ironic contrast. There are the details of Hetty's vain hopes, of Arthur's confident eagerness, of Adam's proud pleasure, of Mr. Poyser's serene trust in his young Squire, expressed in his dinner-speech and in the final touch of bitter mockery with which the episode closes—"It'll serve you to talk on, Hetty, when you're an old woman, how you danced wi' the young Squire the day he come o'age."

The episode, like those from Dickens and Thackeray, is an expansion of the background; both social classes are together on the stage. No very different light is however thrown upon the main characters; George Eliot's purpose seems to have been the emphatic restatement, just before the fatal discovery, of her constant thought, the solidarity of society, the awful burden of human responsibility when complicated with class-responsibility, the socially destructive consequences of individual sin. Her treatment of the story of Hetty and Arthur is remarkable for this persistent view of the *social* aspect of the crime. When Hawthorne treats the consequences of a crime, as he does in his *Seven Gables*, the retribution is personal or hereditary only; the conception, intenser than George Eliot's, is narrower. And when we look at Hardy's treatment of a situation resembling that chosen by George Eliot, we find him handling it not with the constant thought of social consequences but with the central idea of the position forced on Angel Clare and his wife, the feeling for the *individual* situation.

In George Eliot the treatment of the episode resembles the treatment of the whole book in its emphasis upon the framing background. The atmosphere of rural peace is so pervasive in *Adam Bede* that in asking a class, as I often do with regard to a novel, what their most permanent visual impression of the book is, I receive almost invariably the reply—a green

country landscape, with the Poyser homestead. Behind the tragedy of the central story, enveloping it as it were, there is a broad tranquil sunny background of everyday human life, of rural calm. We must realize the enormous value of this background for the artistic effectiveness of the book. It emphasizes the temporary nature of the passing tragedy, it constitutes the norm to the central distortion of wrong and pain. George Eliot has made her story universally true and pathetic in that she has framed the agony of the few in the enclosing phlegmatic calm of nature. In such a book as Hardy's *Tess* the tension becomes over-great by the absence of adequate background; in a book like D'Annunzio's *Triumph of Death* the whole countryside is made to share the spasms of the protagonist. D'Annunzio is the less an artist, George Eliot is the more an artist, because the one disregards, the other aims at, one of the larger truths of life,—the ever-present tragic contrast of a serenely moving world-law with the fevers of humanity. This thought for the framing background, human and natural, is especially clear in the episode from *Adam Bede*. In fact, as I have said, the four episodes selected are very fair examples of the work of their authors; and if taken up in the order named they offer a steady increase in difficulty to the student, from the almost ostentatious crudity of Dickens' work to the microscopic attention to symbolic detail seen in Hawthorne. The interest taken by a class in interpreting this symbolism, in connecting Chapter 17 of the *Seven Gables* with the earlier chapter called "The Arched Window," for example, is extraordinary, and carries them over the difficulty which they invariably experience in adapting their visual range, after working in Thackeray and George Eliot, to the minuteness of the *Seven Gables*, where plot is transformed into protracted situation, and where details take the place of episodes.

ELEANOR P. HAMMOND.

University of Chicago.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TAINE CRITICISM SINCE 1893.

I.

AN attempt was made in 1899 by Wetz in *Zts. Spr. Litt.*, xxii, pp. 114-251, to give an estimate of later Taine-criticism. This article

is largely analytical, and does not attempt any résumé of the progress or development of Taine-criticism, to show how the opinion of critics in general, and of some individual critics in particular, has changed during the short time between his death in 1893, and the present day. The article does not include some of the more important works, confining itself to only eight critics. The present review proposes a discussion of the value of the important articles and works on Taine, and a statement of the progress criticism has made, in regard to the value, significance and importance of Taine's work.

The latest work on Taine, Giraud's *Essai sur Taine*, Hachette, 1901, by far the most complete and satisfactory treatise on the subject, gives an almost complete bibliography of his works in chronological order (published in *Rev. Hist. Litt. Fr.*, July, October, 1900), and of books and articles on Taine. The statistics of this bibliography show more than one hundred and seventy-five references before 1893, and over two hundred and twenty-five from 1893-1901. It is but natural that the criticisms before his death are mainly personal differences of opinion on the function and method of criticism, on the possibilities of the application of his system to both the natural and physical sciences. Many deal with his conception of the world, and among these some are extremely bitter and pessimistic, showing him to be a rank pessimist, destructive materialist, as Caro; absolute determinist and positivist, as Scherer; a firm sceptic, a Spinoza pantheist, as Planche. Such articles, however, emanate from the opposite school of philosophy or from close sectarians. Among all these criticisms there are very few that show an appreciation of the wider scope and significance of Taine's work. Mahrenholtz, Wetz, Pellissier, Sorel, Bourget, Brunetière, and a few of the English and American critics have given the broadest and most liberal estimates of his system and position in the history of literature; but the true meaning of Taine's work was not generally realized in France until after his death. The later critics, Deschamps, Monod, Barzellotti, Faguet, Giraud, and Wetz, are able to treat him from a more liberal and broader, yet at times individual point of view, showing more perspective, comprehension, and appreciation of his work as a whole, than

the earlier critics do. This has largely been made possible by the magnificent biographical essay of Monod, and all critics acknowledge their indebtedness to this work. Among these, Giraud is the first to apply Taine's own system to both himself and his work, and yet Giraud only partly succeeds in holding to this plan of study. This result is largely due to the fact that he introduces the individual religious conception of the universe. Many critics deplore the fact that Taine did not develop his system further, that the first notions of his early youth have remained the same; for the same system and doctrine are found in every work, whether it be a practical illustration of his system, as is his *English Literature*, or a theoretical treatise, as is his *Intelligence*. They failed to see that the only development lay in the accumulation of facts, and through these a broader interpretation of phenomena. This has been corroborated by science.

The present article will be confined to a discussion of Taine's later critics, rather from the standpoint of literary criticism than from that of pure philosophy. In 1893 alone over forty articles of various lengths are noted by Giraud; the more important, giving information on his life especially, are those of Vacherot, de Vogüé, Faguet, Larroumet, Barrès, Berthelot, Deschamps, Mahrenholtz, Boutmy, Barzellotti, Wetz, and Monod, and a series of estimates in the *Rev. Encycl.* 1 April, 1893, by Castets, Pellissier, Pillon, and Petit.

Boutmy, an intimate friend, has left one of the best general impressions we have and has come very near the truth when he states that Taine will not fully be understood and appreciated, that his importance and significance in the history of literary criticism will not be known for half a century; that many of his statements have been taken separately and have thus given a false impression; that his work should be analyzed as a whole. This was written in 1893 and still holds true to-day. Boutmy is the first to acknowledge and reveal that Taine was himself aware of the fact that his system could not be applied to all phenomena with impunity. According to him the danger lay merely in showing the natural complexity of phenomena too simply, and in the fact that the evolutions did not have their full

development. Taine has given us on all the confused masses of literature and history, etc., a point of departure, a mastery and possession, astonishingly profound perspectives and general views and these are really the end of all his speculations.

Hence his desire to transform all abstract notions to concrete ones, to accompany every idea by a sensation and clarify it by comparisons, by facts which he possessed *ad infinitum*.

The general objection to the *Anc. Reg.* (constant repetitions of disorders and crimes, thus becoming monotonous) is shared by Boutmy, Colani, Margerie, Barzellotti, but the reason assigned for this is to stir up the people's patriotism. The article ends with an admirable estimate of Taine, the man and his character.

In the first article in the *Rev. Encycl.* Castets reveals *Taine in time*, in which we gain quite a different view from that which is usual; there we find him receiving his friends at dinner every Monday: Berthelot, Boutmy, G. Paris, Renan, De Heredia, de Vogüé, but never accepting invitations. Pellissier calls Taine and Renan the great apostles of positivism; they have contributed more than any others to its triumph in all provinces of thought. The articles by Pillon and Petit on Taine, the philosopher and historian, are among the few really broad and appreciative estimates we have.

The first large book devoted entirely to Taine is written by Margerie—*H. Taine*, 1893. This work is variously estimated, according to the critic's attitude toward the Church. It is the result of thirty years of the study and teaching of Taine and his philosophy. His aim seems to be to show in what respect Taine is false and destructive of all morality; by what vices of method, by what unconscious prejudices, by what positivistic illusions he has been led to a philosophy which is the negation of philosophy from the speculative summit to its poetical application, from metaphysics to morality. According to Margerie his doctrine is so incoherent and inconsistent that it causes surprise to find such a vigorous and clear mind back of it, p. 68; no philosophy is less complete and less scientific, p. 75;

Taine contradicts himself continually and does not carry out his plan in his *Intelligence*, p. 158. The greater part of the four hundred and sixty-eight pages is an analysis of his works. At every point where Taine bears on the religious organizations and their development, methods and power, Margerie attacks him vigorously, because, according to him, all the defects in Taine's works are due to his strong determinism. Taine cannot speak authoritatively and feelingly on religious matters; he speaks as an outsider, as a man in whose eyes the interior principle, the central heart of religious life has no subjective value, none of truth, none of reality.

The religious interests concern him as a Christian, which he is not, being not even a theist; therefore, the most intimate in religious life escapes him, p. 471. Margerie, however, gives him credit for many fine qualities, a wonderful style: he paints as an analyst, and analyzes as a painter, p. 214.

An article unique in its kind, and possibly the most intimately sympathetic of all, was written by M. de Vogüé near the death-bed of Taine, and published in *Devant le Siècle*, 1896, pp. 289-297. We must know Taine personally, the man, the soul; however high his intelligence, it must be measured by his soul; a life without a stain, hidden too much from life to be known by the crowd. In the eyes of this old man, who had read all and knew all through books, one saw the divine look of a child. No one ever possessed more delicate sentiments for every human creature; more fear of saddening or wounding an honest faith; incapable of the slightest falsehood; he was the living conscience of his friends, who, when about to undertake something new, always asked: What will Taine think of it?

"I have just knelt before the bed of a Saint. If the abnegation of terrestrial things, if the abandonment of a life to eternal truths and to practicing good, merits this name, then no one has merited it more than this Benedictine, astray in our age. In him France lost the head of the literary and thinking world; this was recognized by all Europe."

In a short article in the *Zts. Spr. Litt.*, xv, 141-45, 1893, Mahrenholtz shows a deep appreciation of Taine, especially the historian. He was more of a philosopher and naturalist than an accurate, painstaking scholar, and he must

be judged according to his works and to what he has done; the petty and unimportant must be overlooked. Mahrenholtz claims, and probably rightly, that it must remain the task of the Germans to judge him impartially, and interpret him in the broad light necessary for a full appreciation. This task is yet before them.

The next important work is by Monod: *Renan, Taine, Michelet*, pp. 51-173. All critics acknowledge their indebtedness to this essay for an intimate acquaintance with his life, the relation and connection between his work and his life, and the development of both. It will remain standard until all of his correspondence and posthumous works are published; even then it will continue to be consulted by every Taine student.

The principal points that are new, or at least that were not generally known or appreciated enough, and are brought into prominence by Monod, are his firm convictions and honesty, his fearlessness and courage, his incapability of any personal attack, his opinion that any official system of philosophy or religion was a hindrance to liberty of thought; how Taine was condemned for wanting to apply scientific classification, methods and formulas to literary criticism and history, or for applying scientific methods to the moral sciences; that from the very beginning he refused to reply to any of his critics, because he believed that disputes that transfer questions of doctrines to personal quarrels only obscure the questions, p. 106; the influence of his system upon the young generation of rising writers, p. 108; the various letters Taine wrote to his friends, while yet a young man, explaining his ambitions and the pretensions of his doctrines; especially his letter to M. Havet, pp. 115-117; the influence of his married life and the change it brought about in his attitude toward the world, p. 199 sqq.; the effect of the war of 1870; the work he had planned. According to Monod the *Intelligence* forms the center of his work, all others are mere illustrations. From 1848-1850 he created his method and system; 1853-1858 he gathered particular cases and verifications of his system, *La Fontaine, Livy, Essays*; 1858-1868 he applied them to large literary and artistic generalization; 1870-1893

he applied them to a vast historical generalization. The study of Taine must depart from this classification, and Monod is the first to outline this plan. He is also the first to describe the state of French thought during this time, pp. 135-141, and to show Taine as the product of race, environment and time. Monod, as many later critics, has analyzed Taine and found his salient quality to be powerful logic, in which lies his weakness and grandeur, the secret of his power and of his defects, a wonderful mathematical mind, with a remarkable gift of visual imagination.

This combined faculty, according to Monod, explains the whole phenomenon of a Taine-system, imagination, style, p. 157. He is the first to insist upon the fact that in the study of Taine his method cannot be separated from his theories, and to explain why this cannot be done by giving an accurate account of his life and character which form part of his work. Monod is possibly the most impartial of Taine's critics, never hesitating to unveil his defects; for example, he simplified complex phenomena too much; exaggeration and incompleteness. This essay has made it possible for later critics to write or develop a complete study of Taine, the man and his work.

Pellissier, in his *Nouv. Ess. sur la Litt. Contemp.*, 1894, has a most suggestive article on Taine, analyzing his method, system and their result. According to him he must be studied under three heads: as a literary critic, as a historian, as a philosopher, and the necessary relation among them. The difference between his system and that of Sainte-Beuve is especially well brought out. Taine is the coordinator of knowledge; Sainte-Beuve studies the individual only; literary productions are mere documents and criticism an art; he is the initiator of the natural method of criticism, while Taine is the organizer.

According to Taine there is no difference of nature between the moral and natural or material world, human and natural history; both undergo the same organic laws; hence the same method is applied to the study of both.

Pellissier's article is one of the best to analyze Taine's method, or rather to interpret it, giving a clear exposition of the laws of

dependencies, salient quality and primordial forces; the advantages and objections of the system, pointing out how often Taine either neglects the traits that cannot be applied to his formula, or forces minor traits too much in order to explain and prove his formula, thus being often very unreliable; constantly pre-occupied with philosophy and the finding of laws, Taine overlooked the importance of individuality. As a whole, his system is no longer used; it remains what it was with Sainte-Beuve. His place is fixed in modern criticism by the force of his reasoning and the beautiful symmetry of his constructions, and yet his influence is still great. He has stated precisely and put in order and grouped the ideas that had been floating about for years, more or less vague, in the contemporaneous atmosphere; he has so put his stamp on them, grouped them with such vigor, that we really look upon them as his own; so that, were we to seek a name that would embody the truest character of the intellectual movement of the last fifty years, we must name Taine.

In February, 1895, Taine's successor to the French Academy was installed, and in his *Discours* (published in *Nouv. Ess. d'Hist. et de Crit.*, pp. 119-144) M. Sorel has given an admiral portrait of Taine the man, and a splendid critical penetration of his work. To study the soul in itself, in the man of genius, in the history of human society, to see man as he is, neither monstrous nor abortive; to put him in his place in nature; to show that all in him and about him leads to a union of laws, and that the ideal towards which all aspirations tend is also the end of all the forces of nature and the universe, this is Taine's aim and purpose.

The report of this installation is made by M. G. Paris, in the *Débats*, February 8, 1895, (published in *Poètes et Penseurs*, pp. 340-348). Taine he considers as one of the five or six men that have represented intellectual France before the world; the most serious, the moral nobility, the sentiment of the beautiful, the power of work and love of truth. His glory shines brighter than ever. If, according to Taine, man is a "théorème qui marche," his life and works are certainly a "théorème qui évolue." This is growing evident more and

more, the more he is studied the more his grand life penetrates us by its example of honor, uprightness and industry; it expands as his works.

Barzellotti's book, *La Philosophie de Taine*, 1895, 1900, pp. 440, is from a philosophical point of view the most profound and penetrating work published; those parts treating of his literary qualities and his system as a whole have been treated with more literary penetration and knowledge by others; the work is really of much more importance to the student of philosophy than to the student of literature, although it does treat at length of Taine as a writer, and of his influence.

The first aim of the book is to examine the principles on which his doctrine is based, and the method that governs it, to show what there is elevated, durable, fruitful, defective, exclusive, contradictory and artificial; but the principal aim, and this is entirely new in Taine criticism, is to examine whether Taine can be defined, *au fond*, as a French intellect, fructified by ideas of Germanic origin and tradition. A secondary aim is to put Taine under the light of contemporaneous culture, proving that the motives and inspiring intentions of his genius and art respond to the intellectual exigencies of the time. Barzellotti, in a most admirable, clear manner shows the development of Taine's system, due especially to the intellectual need of research, demonstration and truth; the position he occupies towards philosophy, simply seeking a path to follow in the wake of ideas; his originality lies in his deep sympathy for all previous systems, his deep appreciation and exact interpretation of them; but, the author adds, his work somewhat surpassed this pretention.

His salient quality lies in a logical power of abstraction, of conceiving by means of general ideas and of deducting from these. His contact with the German spirit gave birth to and developed the most original part of his doctrine, the conception of the great law of the unity of things and their necessity; this he owes to Spinoza, Hegel and Goethe, pp. 31-35. It lies rather outside of the limits of this paper to state what Barzellotti has so clearly done, with regard to Taine's debt to Spinoza, Herder, Hegel and Goethe; in this field he has done more than any other critic. Taine's

originality lies in having created a species of comparative psychology of the primitive varieties of the organism and systems of human culture, which must be for their history what comparative anatomy of animals and plants is for zoölogy and botany, p. 101. It is interesting to note how opinion is gradually changing on the merit of Taine's *English Literature*. All later critics are coming to consider it as one of the most powerful and vigorous books of the latter half of this century. Barzellotti says the introduction is the most vigorous piece of historical philosophy written in France in our day; some of the pages of the work, for example, on Milton, Byron, etc., are enough to preserve the memory of any writer, p. 114.

Another new point he brings out is that Taine's works are lifelike and living, because of the ardent sympathy with which he has known how to find the most hidden vibrations in the hearts of eminent men; also, that Taine saw clearly that there was a limit to his own mind, but not to the human mind, which must be considered in the application of his method, and which accounts for the sympathy with which he knew how to transport himself into the products of the culture, thought and art of three peoples, for the continual research along the path in which the ideas and forms of literary invention can pass from one people and race to another, and take on a new impress; this brings him out as the greatest of modern French critics, p. 160.

An interesting study would be to examine the various judgments critics passed upon the nature of his studies of individuals, as Racine, etc. According to Barzellotti, in point of *finesse* and truth of historical and psychological examination, they have no equal; other critics denounce them utterly, refusing them any truth or life.

Taine's sociological-historical theory, studying in the work of art above all the sign of certain hereditary aptitudes and the necessary product of a certain moral temperament is not accepted by many historical scholars; Guyau is possibly the most prominent among those who uphold it; it may be stated, however, that many of the later scholars are leaning toward this theory. Hennequin opposes it; Barzellotti does not oppose it altogether.

To accuse him of having suppressed all

morality from history, by applying this theory, as Margerie does, is going too far. Few books breathe such a high moral sentiment and a more noble indignation against evil, p. 290.

According to Barzellotti all of Taine's comparative studies on the past of literature, art, and the social life of Europe can be looked upon as an introduction or preparatory study to his *Origines Contemporaines*, and this is a psychology of the mind and soul of his country, an anxious clinical diagnosis of his beloved patient, La France, p. 344. The work must be judged from the large aspect of art, as the last result of a literary elaboration to which a writer arrives in giving us his conception according to the plan he has traced and the aim he has proposed. Judged from this point of view, it impresses our author as a work which presupposes another or others to which it replies; it is the reply of an accuser to a defense already presented, of the partisan of the Revolution and Empire, p. 346. This attitude is entirely new. Barzellotti's conclusion is: As for the entire work, the grandeur of the enterprise seems to have surpassed the measure, if not of his talent, at least of his forces and his physical vigor; but the monumental and what is new will endure and those who cover this field by a different road will never lose sight of the profound traces which Taine has left, p. 350. This view is of great interest, coming from such a profound and trustworthy authority. From him the spirit of Taine's work is one of the vastest inquiries into facts and moral data on man and life ever undertaken in aid of historical investigation; no one before him has known better how to study souls, crowds, peoples, races, instead of soul, individual, race, p. 405.

In giving a general estimate of this work, it may be called the most comprehensive, profound, appreciative and satisfactory study on Taine that has appeared up to 1900, in some respects up to the present day.

The essay of Salomon in *Études et Portr. Litt.*, 1896, first appeared in the *Gaz. de France*, 1894; it hardly deserves a place among the more important works on Taine.

Wyzewa, *Nos Maîtres*, 1895, makes the statement that Taine is hardly a scholar or philosopher, but a method, a prodigious *ensemble* of

formulas and operations, the most complicated, harmonious, perfect literary machine. This article, and those of Rod, Tissot, Colani, Lemaitre, Renard and Biré, are all rather short, and more or less interesting reading, but they have added nothing new to the study of Taine.

HUGO P. THIEME.

University of Michigan.

THE SOURCES OF ROMEO AND JULIET.

A comparison of Arthur Brooke's version of the story of Romeo and Juliet with that of Paynter shows that they are absolutely identical in plot. There is not an incident in one that is not in the other, nor in the order of incidents is there to be found any variation. One of two things must be true—and the first is mentioned only as a bare possibility, and to be at once dismissed as altogether unlikely: either Paynter made a metaphrase of Brooke's poem, or both followed pretty slavishly the same original. Boisteau's translation—or rather paraphrase—of Bandello's novel is not easily accessible. But if one postulates that paraphrase as the original of Brooke and Paynter, one may be absolutely certain what its plot is. There is no conflict in the testimony of two witnesses about it.

Boisteau took large liberties with his Italian original. Besides the important difference of not having Juliet wake before Romeo dies, there are several minor differences, one of which will serve by way of illustration. In Boisteau Romeo buys his poison of an apothecary whom he tempts by a handful of gold to break the law, for selling poison was a capital crime. Romeo is careful to put the name of this apothecary in the post-mortem letter he writes his father, and the poor fellow is promptly apprehended and tortured to death. It is difficult to see why Boisteau went out of his way to make the hero of his story do so unspeakably mean a thing as to tempt a man to wrong-doing by taking advantage of his poverty, and then report him to the authorities. The Bandello Romeo takes a vial of deadly poison and goes to Verona, but nothing is said about where he got it.

The Bandello story is so different from that

of Boisteau as to suggest that it was probably not an Italian stage on which Brooke "saw the same argument lately set forth;" for it may be fairly supposed that an Italian play-wright would have stuck pretty closely to his *Bandello*. This, of course, has some bearing on the question as to whether there was an old English play on *Romeo and Juliet* which Shakespeare may have had before him.

One feels pretty certain that Shakespeare never saw the *Bandello* story, though in two or three not very important particulars *Bandello* is nearer Shakespeare than Brooke and Paynter are. For example, there is a rather more suggestive outline of the character of *Mercutio* in *Bandello* than is to be found in either of the English versions of the story. Then, too, the movement of the story is rapid and does not give one the impression of covering much time. But these particulars have not much significance. One cannot help feeling that if Shakespeare had read *Bandello* it is more than likely he would not have allowed *Romeo* to die without a farewell from *Juliet*, and would have had them breathe out their lives together.

If ever Shakespeare saw the Paynter version he must have made merry over it. Without being at all familiar with the original, one does not hesitate to say that Paynter's translation is one of the wretchedest attempts at that sort of thing to be found anywhere in the world. It is as frigid as an Eskimo classic. A stupid schoolboy could not be more stiff and awkward and bungling. Here is *Romeo's* greeting just after the death of *Tybalt*:

"Mine owne dearest friende Julietta, I am not nowe determined to recite the particulars of the strange happes of frayle and inconstant Fortune, who in a momente hoystethe a man up to the hyghest degree of hir wheel, and by and by in lesse space than in the twynckling of an eye she throweth hym downe agayne so lowe, as more miserie is prepared for him in one day, than favour in one hundred years."

Brooke's version of *Romeo's* speech shows passionate feeling and some attempt at natural utterance that shall have both strength and grace. The Boisteau figure of the wheel is piously retained but mercifully modified. *Bandello* manages the entire scene much better than his adapter did. As to the question of Shakespeare's use of Paynter as a source,

what has already been said furnishes plain indications of the nature of the answer, though judgment may well be held in abeyance for the moment. A little later in the discussion a more emphatic answer may be made.

As was said at the outset, a comparison of Paynter and Brooke shows identity of plot; but such a comparison shows, too, several interesting differences and one of very great importance. In a way these differences are all of the same sort: they concern themselves with characterization. Brooke does a good deal towards making the personages of the story real and their conduct plausible. In two cases, at least, under Brooke's hands *Romeo* is greatly improved. Paynter devotes two pages to describing the perturbation and grief in which *Juliet* wore away the night after meeting and falling in love with *Romeo* and then finding out that he was a *Montague*. Barely two lines are devoted to describing *Romeo's* feelings under circumstances that are exactly parallel. *Romeo* shows a philosophic coolness that does him no credit, and is entirely out of keeping with his temperament. Brooke comes to the rescue and gives nearly a page to showing that the night was a sleepless one for *Romeo* too, and prepares us for his appearance bright and early next morning under *Juliet's* window.

Again, Paynter dilates at length on the misery of *Juliet* after *Romeo's* banishment, but says that *Romeo*, with books and boon companions, passed the time very pleasantly. Take men and women by and large and Paynter's contrast is pretty near the truth, but it will not do for the *Romeo* and *Juliet* of this story. So Brooke has left out the books and boon companions altogether, and shows us *Romeo* every bit as unhappy in Mantua as *Juliet* is in Verona.

But let us consider the most important addition Brooke made to the Boisteau story. It is the Nurse. In Brooke's poem the Nurse is a really fine piece of characterization. She is not Shakespeare's creation at all. She does not show a single trait of character in the play that she does not show in the poem. Her garrulousness—so tantalizing to the lovers—her free and familiar speech, her graphic

homely phrase, her sordid ethics and quick transference of allegiance from the banished lover to the one at home—all this is admirably brought out in Brooke, and more besides. Shakespeare, with Peter and Mercutio as accessories, has not given us a better Nurse than Brooke's. So far from the Nurse being notably Shakespeare's creation, it would be difficult to point out another person in all the Shakespeare multitude that came so nearly ready-made to his hand.

If it were not for the possible existence of an Old English play having for its subject the story of Romeo and Juliet, one could say unhesitatingly that Shakespeare used Brooke as his chief source. There could be no doubt that he wrote his play with Brooke before him. Perhaps this is the place for the promised emphatic answer to the question as to Shakespeare's indebtedness to Paynter. Why would he need Paynter's paraphrase before him? There is everything in Brooke that there is in Paynter and a good many things besides. Can one imagine Shakespeare tolerating the unnecessary presence of Paynter's story? That Shakespeare owed nothing to Paynter is a practical certainty.

But to return to this Old English play. There may have been such a play, which furnished Brooke with his characterization of the Nurse. In that case, Shakespeare may have had access to it also, and so owe nothing to Brooke. The fact that Brooke shows considerable skill in characterization all through the poem, and especially in situations with which it is not at all likely any play ever dealt, as in the Romeo examples already cited,—leads one to think that the characterization of the Nurse, as good as it is, was not beyond Brooke's powers, and that it is not necessary to postulate the existence of an old play to account for anything in Brooke's poem.

In passing from *The Sources of Romeo and Juliet* to the play itself, it may be worth while to notice the variations in Juliet's age as she appears in the four stories. In *Bandello* she is eighteen, in Brooke sixteen, in Paynter eighteen, in Shakespeare fourteen. In Boisteau she is eighteen, one argues. Brooke could feel that eighteen was too aged to suit the Elizabethan public, and so made his

heroine a couple of years younger. Shakespeare, understanding his public better, put her at fourteen. Paynter, utterly impervious to publics, follows his Boisteau.

Attention has already been called to the fact that Boisteau's most notable change in the *Bandello* story is in the scene in the tomb of the Capulets. Curiously enough Shakespeare's most important variation from Boisteau's version is in the treatment of this very scene. It is hard to see what artistic end the introduction of Paris suberves. His presence there is an intrusion. His death at Romeo's hands is not at all a dramatic necessity. Shakespeare has quite robbed the scene of all the pathetic dignity and appealing sense of unavailing woe which it has in the Italian original, or even in Brooke's poem. Throughout the play we see so little of Paris—he appears but three times, and for only a moment each time—and he is so colorless when we do see him, that it is with a start that we are reminded of his existence when he comes into the tomb. Boisteau marred *Bandello*, and Shakespeare marred Boisteau.

Among other minor variations one or two may be noted. It is not easy to see why the play should end with the Friar and Romeo's servant still in custody. Evidently the Prince in saying that "Some shall be pardon'd and some shall be punished," meant that these two should be pardoned; but who should be punished? the "poor 'pothecary?" Romeo writes in his letter to his father that he bought his poison of a poor apothecary; but after reading Romeo's interview with the apothecary one feels nothing but pity for the poor wretch whom Romeo's gold and eloquence overcame, and one cannot help feeling sorry that Romeo should have spoken even vaguely of a poor apothecary at Mantua. Even that would serve as a clue for the police. Who else shall be punished? the Nurse? But she does not appear in this last act of the play and seems to have dropped quite out of consideration.

All this may seem like making a good deal of stir about a trifle; it is a trifle, but it goes to show Shakespeare's occasional carelessness in the handling of material. Probably when Shakespeare wrote the line "Some shall be

pardon'd and some punished," he had in mind not his own play but Brooke's poem. There the Friar and Romeo's servant were pardoned, the Nurse banished, and the Apothecary put to death. It seems as if in winding up his play Shakespeare clung too closely to the ending of a rather different story. To have wound up the play—as Bandello did his story—with the Prince's pardon of the Friar and the servant, and saying nothing about punishing anybody—for who indeed is there to punish?—would have made a more fitting close.

In managing the death of Tybalt Shakespeare has greatly improved upon his original. In Boisteau's version of the story Romeo comes upon a street fight between partisans of the rival houses, with the help of bystanders tries to part the combatants, is savagely attacked by Tybalt, and partly in sudden anger and partly in self-defence kills him. It is a rough and tumble affair, and the part Romeo plays is rather vulgar and unheroic. In Shakespeare, Romeo, though he has shown himself patient under the insults of Tybalt, when he learns that Tybalt has slain Mercutio, in noble rage dares him to combat, and kills him in really heroic fashion. And, too, Shakespeare has substituted the distinctness so absolutely necessary in dramatic action for the hopeless confusion of the original quarrel.

In comparing Shakespeare with his original the most noticeable difference in plot is that of order. In Boisteau Tybalt does not come into the story until it is time to be killed; Paris, until it is time for Juliet to marry. In Shakespeare these two men and Mercutio—all of whom are so necessary to the progress of the play, and do so much to keep it going—are introduced at once. And they are brought before us often enough to prepare our minds for the parts they are to play. Thus the first time we see Tybalt he is trying to pick a quarrel with the pacific Benvolio. Then at Capulet's party it is Tybalt who is eager to fight Romeo for having presumed to come, but the master of the house insists that there shall be no disturbance. By this time we are properly prepared for Tybalt's doing the thing he is in the play for, namely, getting into a quarrel that shall result in his death at the hands of Romeo.

ARTHUR J. ROBERTS.

Colby College.

AN EARLIER WAVERLEY.

SIR WALTER SCOTT, in his introductory chapter to *Waverley*, gives a pleasant account of the motives that led him to choose his title. After discarding "the chivalrous epithets of Howard, Mordaunt, or Stanley" and "the softer and more sentimental sounds of Belmour, Belville, Belfield, and Belgrave" as too familiar, he goes on to say

"I have, therefore, like a maiden knight with his white shield, assumed for my hero, WAVERLEY, an uncontaminated name, bearing with its sound little of good or evil, excepting what the reader shall hereafter be pleased to affix to it."

Though the passage as a whole is whimsically vague, Scott evidently expected his public to infer that *Waverley* was a name hitherto unknown in English fiction. Such, however, was not the case. In 1792, thirteen years before Scott began his romance, Mrs. Charlotte Smith published a novel called *Desmond*, containing a family of Waverlys [*sic*]. The father has died sometime before the opening of the story, leaving a comfortable fortune to his wife Elizabeth, two daughters named Geraldine and Frances, and a younger son known as Mr. Waverly. Geraldine, already married to a Mr. Varney, survives her disreputable husband, and falls to the lot of the hero Lionel Desmond. Frances finds her happiness in the possession of a French nobleman who has lost his title as a result of the Revolution. And Mr. Waverly plays the part of friend to the hero. The novel made considerable stir, owing to its emotional defense of the French Revolution. Burke was answered and Paine was eulogized. If Mrs. Smith lost in consequence some of her friends, she had the pleasure of seeing a quick second edition of her novel and a version in French. That Scott read the novel before beginning *Waverley*, there can be no reasonable doubt. And yet direct proof of the fact is wanting. For a collection of his prose miscellanies (1827), Scott pieced out with critical remarks a memoir of Charlotte Smith written (but not published) by her sister Mrs. Catherine Dorset. In his additions, he speaks of the deep impression that Mrs. Smith's works made on his mind at "a distant date" and analyzes several of her novels from memory, but he is curiously silent on *Desmond*. In his *Journal*, however, under the date 16 Mar. 1826, he records: "In the evening after dinner,

read Mrs. Charlotte Smith's *Desmond*—decidedly the worst of her compositions." And the next year (18 Jan.), he was at work on the "critique of Charlotte Smith's novels," for which, notwithstanding his assertion in the critique itself, he had been refreshing his memory. That Scott, who was usually so ready to talk about his "conveyances," did not at this late day remark the "coincidence" in name of Mr. Waverly and Edward Waverley must be ascribed, I think, to whim rather than to prick of conscience. He preferred to leave the discovery to the curious.

The discovery was made by Leigh Hunt in his delightful "A Novel Party" (in *Men, Women, and Books*, 1847), where appeared Mr. Waverly inquiring "after his celebrated namesake." The two novels are far apart in subject and in aim; and yet one characteristic of the earlier gentleman passed into the second. Critics who have thought it worth while to strip Scott's Waverley of his armor and romantic surroundings that they might see what was left, have found as a residuum a strange vacillation in temperament which leads him hither and thither. Vacillation was likewise the ruling passion of Mrs. Smith's Waverly. His sister Geraldine says of him:

"It is not his youth, or the expensive style in which he sets out, that disquiet me so much as that uncommon indecision of mind, which never allows him to know what he will do a moment before he acts."

On this line his character is unfolded until he eventually marries a "fair aristocrat" chosen for him by his mother, and the "fluctuating lover" retires with his bride to Bexly Hill. When the curtain is rung down on the scene, his mother-in-law is striving to procure for him an Irish peerage, which his sister Frances thinks should be under the title of "Baron Weathercock." Scott's Waverley is much more than a weathercock, but he is that too.

If popular fiction of Scott's youth were closely examined, very likely other Waverleys would be found. One other I recall. In 1790, James White, a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, published a preposterous historical romance named from its hero *The Adventures of John of Gaunt*, which was soon turned into German. Here we read of a certain Sir Humphrey de Waverley "better known . . . by

the appellation of the knight who affects to be unaffected." He is said to be

"of an ancient house, and a person of a valiant mind; but, finding that affectation was accounted a defect which obscured, or at least distorted the most admirable virtues, he hath determined to pass through life with an unparalleled simplicity."

Scott has left no record of having read this romance in which the name Waverley is spelled after his own heart.

WILBUR L. CROSS.

Yale University.

SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN.

I.

Schiller's Wallenstein. Edited with introduction, notes, and map, by MAX WINKLER, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901. 8vo, lxxvi+446 pp.¹

Wallenstein. Ein dramatisches Gedicht von Schiller. With an introduction and notes by W. H. CARRUTH, Ph. D. Second edition, revised. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1901. lxxxvi, 456 pp.²

LACK of space prevented me from adding to my previous general review of Prof. Winkler's edition some further remarks on a few individual points. Hence, they are published now as a second instalment of that review.

INTRODUCTION. P. xvii. "King of the Romans" should be omitted or explained.—P. xxxi. The brevity of the language used in describing the second *Revers*, "to remain loyal to him to the last," is rather misleading and hardly consistent with the second next sentence, "Wallenstein hoped thereby to convince the emperor of his continued loyalty." As a matter of fact, while the above quoted expression of the first *Revers* was reiterated, the second document was far more cautious and guarded than the first and placed the main emphasis on the saving clause concerning the rights of the emperor. It has been correctly characterized as an *Abschwächung des ersten*. —P. xlvi. The passage from the letter to Goethe of Dec. 12, 1797,³ is inaccurately rendered. *Der übrigen Handlung* is not a genitive dependent on *Zwecken*, but a dative governed by *entgegengesetzt*. The passage means: "love,

¹ Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, June 1901, xvi, 368-375.

² Cf. MOD. LANG. NOTES, March 1895, x, 162-172.

by its freedom from all aim, stands in contrast with the rest of the action. . ."—In the quotation from the letter of Nov. 9, 1798, *der übrigen Staatsaktion* is not "the rest of the political action," but "the rest of the action, which (rest) deals with politics."—P. xlix. The discussion of the *Oedipus Rex* in connection with Schiller's letter of Oct. 2, 1797, produces a wrong impression, in so far as Schiller distinctly deplores the fact that Wallenstein is *not* of the Oedipus type and that he has in vain tried to find a tragic plot resembling it.—P. li. "The cause of this new division was due to the fact . . ." is an impossible tautology.—P. lix. "William Slawata" looks odd.—P. lv. Heide's article in *Z. f. d. U.*, viii, 497 ff., might well have been mentioned, since it is easily accessible and sufficient for a first rapid orientation. Of Liliencron's article the first instalment (pp. 212-235) is omitted.—P. lviii. Why "Sesyma," since "Sesin" is used in all other instances?—P. lxxii ff. The character sketch of Octavio is, on the whole, not to be called satisfactory. It is not free from inconsistencies and impresses one as if the editor's heart was but little in his efforts more or less to exculpate Octavio. In the end we hardly know what estimate we are to place on Octavio's conduct.—The *map* is exceedingly *unübersichtlich*. It contains a host of unnecessary names in tantalizing type, while of places mentioned in the drama we miss, for example, Frauenberg.

TEXT. *Picc.*, l. 840. "Die Goten," as far as I know, is the reading of all editions.³ And yet it must be an error. The emphasis on *Die* and not on *Goten* is illogical, even though, in my opinion, the latter term is not contemptuously used. In fact, Prof. Winkler's own reference to Schiller's *Gesch. d. dreissigjäh. Krieges* shows that Schiller, in imitation of his sources, used the term without any derogatory force. See also Dr. Breul's note.—*Tod*, 16. Is the dash, which all editions⁴ seem to have after *senkrecht*, not perhaps a traditional error for a hyphen? A hyphen would be natural to indicate the omission of the inflectional *-er*,⁵ while a dash seems quite uncalled

for, especially if we consider that the next line although expressing the same contrast, has no punctuation whatever (see Goedeke). A good example of the practical identity of dash and hyphen is furnished from Lessing in Könncke, first ed., p. 169, ll. 15-16. Whether for *Wallenstein* the same confusion is plausible I cannot now determine. But the point seems worth while looking into.—*Tod*, 1078, 1108, and elsewhere, the comma at the end of the line seems hardly to be sufficient punctuation according to modern usage.—*Tod*, 3393. Read *euch* and *ihr*. Evidently the Swedes are meant, not the Swedish captain.

NOTES. *Prol.*, 131. *Ihr alles deutsches Recht* refers primarily to *des Reimes Spiel*, which is in apposition with it, only indirectly to the *Knüttelvers* as such. If later on the editor says "The German public was then so unaccustomed to the use of metre in the drama," "metre" is undoubtedly a misprint for "rhyme." As to the *Knüttelvers* used by Goethe in his *Storm and Stress* period, its apparent differences from Hans Sachs's verse seem to me to deserve more consideration than they generally receive at the hands of editors of *Faust* or *Wallenstein*. Cf., for example, Sommer, *Die Metrik des Hans Sachs*, p. 2 ff.; Helm, *Zur Rhythmik der kurzen Reimpaare d. 16. Jh.*, p. 99 ff.; Belling, *Die Metrik Schillers*, p. 244.—*Lager*, 14. Rhymes like *führen: probieren* every student of German has met by the dozen long before undertaking *Wallenstein*. If the matter was to be mentioned at all, *ö: e* and *eu: ei* rhymes should have been included. (Compare, for example, 179-181, 314-315, 497-498, 640-641, etc.) The statement that such rhymes are also found "in Goethe, as in *Faust*, Pt. 1, ll. 62-64, 231-234" has a strange ring to it, considering the fact that they occur not only in all works of Goethe (Compare Belling, *Goethes Metrik*, ii, pp. 11-12; Vischer, *Kleine Beiträge zur Charakteristik Goethes*, *Goethe-Jb.*, iv, p. 7; and Hildebrand's excellent article on this subject in *Z. f. d. U.*, vii, 153 ff.), but in almost every German poet since the days of Sebastian Brant and Hans Sachs. Off hand I could mention only the purist Platen as a striking exception to this rule; and a glance into, for example, Tille's *Songs of To-day* will convince one that even of the most modern poets the majority still follow the same usage.—*Lager*, 70. *Gemunkel* and

³ Whether the change in Prof. Carruth's text (first and second editions) is intentional or not, I do not know. His notes do not call attention to it, although it involves a deviation from Goedeke.

⁴ I now notice for the first time that Bellermann prints *mit senkrecht oder schräger Strahlung*, without however making any reference to the change in his notes or variants.

⁵ Cf., for example, *Faust*, 279, *Sonn- und Wellen*, etc.

Geschicke cannot be said to form alliteration.—*Lager*, 181. Refer to *Lager*, 14.—*Lager*, 263. Read "passieren lassen, tolerate."—*Lager*, 271. Is *Soff* here not rather 'liquor' (so, for example, Sanders) than *das Saufen*?—*Lager*, 420. This pleonastic use of the possessive in modern colloquial speech, to my knowledge, is more common with the dative (south and midland) and accusative (north) than with the genitive. Compare Blatz, ii, 365.—*Lager*, 454. The *dazu* in the quotation from Sanders is meaningless. In Sanders it refers to *ein Ziel*, immediately preceding.—*Lager*, 479. The remark is quite correct, but rather ill-placed in view of Churchill's excellent rendering "bottle . . . battle."—*Lager*, 500. For "assonance" read "rhyme."—*Lager*, 554. The unusual *auf niemand lügt* requires a note. Compare, for example, Sirach, 19, 15.—*Lager*, 846. For *Beding* refer to *Faust*, I, 1. 3001.—*Picc.*, 82. In discussing the use of the pronouns of address, the rather unusual *du* in *Tod*, 1857 ff., and 3228 ff., should not have been overlooked.—*Picc.*, 858. The unusually pleonastic form *hätt' auch geschehen sein können*, for either *hätt' geschehn können* (metrically acceptable) or *könnte geschehen sein* seems thus far to have escaped the attention of the editors. Compare the similar expression in Lessing's *Emilia Galotti*, ii, 4, *Du hättest mir das sogleich sollen gemeldet haben*.—*Picc.*, 995 ff. The poetic import of this passage, as of *Tod*, 1 ff., can hardly be claimed to be dependent on an exact understanding of the astrological points involved. If, however, an attempt is made to elucidate the matter, the explanations should not be more enigmatical than the text itself. Prof. Winkler's note bears comparison with those of Breul and Carruth, but, unless my own astronomical obtuseness is at fault, none of these notes represents the matter intelligibly. If the heavens (that is, day and night heavens, of course) are divided into twelve houses, six above and six below the horizon, and if the house just below the horizon in the east is counted as the first and called 'rising,' I am unable to see how the last, that is, twelfth house (so Breul and Carruth) or one of the last four (so Winkler) can possibly be called 'setting.' The last house by necessity is the one adjoining the first, and

the seventh, that is, the one just above the horizon in the west, would be the setting one *par excellence*. (Cf., for example, the diagram in Brockhaus, *Konversationslexikon*, s. v. *Horoskop*.)⁶ The numbering, by the way, does not proceed toward the zenith (Carruth), but in the opposite direction, that is, in the order in which the signs of the zodiac follow upon each other. As to the *Ecken* of l. 997, I am inclined to consider this expression merely as a metaphor for an out-of-the-way place, suggested by *Häuser*; for I cannot see how neighboring houses can 'intersect' and form 'corners' or 'angles,' except possibly at the poles of their common axis. Or are we to think of the *Eckhäuser* mentioned in the omitted passage after *Tod*, 21 (cf. Goedeke's edition, p. 209)? At any rate, *seinen* in l. 997, literally interpreted, refers to corners of the heavens, not of the houses. These brief remarks are more intended to raise a question than to settle it; for what has been stated is sufficient, I believe, to prove the desirability of a thorough revision of our current notes on this point on the basis of the astrological authorities most likely to have been consulted by Schiller. Düntzer, who so often delights in treating extraneous matter at great length, merely refers in this instance to Schleiden's *Wallenstein und die Astrologie*, Lpzg., 1855, to which I have no access.—*Picc.*, 2124. Refer to *Götz*, Weimar ed., p. 40, l. 2, *Bei Tisch geht alles drein*.—*Tod*, 2. If Beller-mann's interpretation (in his *second* edition!) is correct, something should be said about the meaning of l. 30.—*Tod*, 161. *Der Doppelsinn des Lebens* has a wider significance than 'his equivocal conduct.' Compare Breul's full note.—*Tod*, 164. The remarkable frequency of this construction (due to the style of one of the sources?) in certain portions of the *Gesch. d. dreissigjäh. Krieges* might have been mentioned. The parts edited by Prof. Palmer contain numerous examples.—*Tod*, 234. The statement "*Euer* is monosyllabic" (so also Breul) must be called in question, if we con-

⁶ Cf. the still different explanation of Beller-mann in his edition, where *cadens*, without reference to 'setting,' is taken to mean 'ominous.' Beller-mann's explanation, indefinite as it is, tallies fairly well with the statement in *Enc. Brit.*, 9th ed., ii, 742, (s. v. *Astrology*): "The four ages of man had each three houses in the Zodiac. Each of this triple series was composed of a cardinal, a succeeding, and a declining or cadent house."

sider the relative frequency of anapests in *Wallenstein*. While less frequent, they are not unheard of in even the first foot. Cf., for example, *Picc.*, 1205 and 2647. Also Belling, *Die Metrik Schillers*, p. 193.—*Tod*, 342. *Sonst* with transposed order, used as a subordinating conjunction (compare Sanders, s.v., *widrigenfalls*) deserves comment.—*Tod*, 491. Refer to *Picc.*, 772.—*Tod*, 652. *Unter ihrem Herzen*, in its technical sense (*ein Kind unter dem Herzen tragen*) is not likely to be understood without a note.—*Tod*, 1242. Refer to l. 1338.—*Tod*, 1807. As plural *Läger* persisted far longer than as singular, so that in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries *Läger* was felt as a secondary plural of *Lager*. Cf. Grimm and Sanders, where examples for the plural are quoted from authors like Becker, Rückert, Klinger, Freiligrath and others, who would never have used it as a singular.—*Tod*, 1843. *Gewehr in Arm* calls for a note; for the exact meaning does not seem at all clear. Compare Buchheim, Breul, Flügel, Muret-Sanders. In some way or other, as the context suggests, it must mean "stand at ease."—*Tod*, 2619. As to *diesen Abend*, as far as I can see, neither interpretation (the natural "this evening" or the unheard of "last evening") establishes a satisfactory chronology for the events concerned. Why then try to put an impossible interpretation on a plain everyday expression? If *diesen Abend*, spoken fairly late on a certain evening in February (cf. *Tod*, 2818 and 2825!) can refer to the evening of the preceding day, it might just as well refer to almost anything else. On the other hand, I agree with Prof. Winkler in not accepting Kettner's explanation, which certainly is not so much of a panacea as Dr. Breul seems to think. It is not only unwarranted by fact, but it fails to explain. One needs to consider only this one point: Max leaves Pilsen 'in the early afternoon' and yet gets to Neustadt (at least sixty miles off) in time to open battle 'at nightfall' (that is, about five o'clock for February. Cf. l. 3020)! But the Swedish courier leaving Neustadt in the morning does not reach Eger (barely one-half that distance) until the evening! It is true, Dr. Breul in his table, assigns *Tod*, iv, 1-8 to the 'afternoon.' But if Wallenstein heard the firing in the evening or possibly late

in the afternoon, and was then as far away from Eger as ll. 2621-2622 naturally suggest, he cannot have entered the city before night. Those, on the other hand, who explain *diesen Abend* = *gestern Abend* (as Winkler and Carruth) are obliged not only to credit desperate Max and his Pappenheimer with a feat of sixty miles in from four to five hours, but also to expect Wallenstein *with all his troops* to have traveled fully thirty miles (Prof. Carruth compromises on twenty eight) in about the same length of time! In short, to my mind, the chronology is hopelessly confused and furnishes a rather interesting and instructive parallel to the well-known *übermorgen* in *Faust*, 3662, which likewise has been twisted into a never-heard-of meaning.—*Tod*, 2628. *Joachimsthal* does not seem to refer primarily to the city but to the locality in general, hence *im* instead of *in*.—*Tod*, 2840. Should there not be a note on *Burg*, as compared with *Schloss* (2831 and 3210), *Festung* (2839), and *Stadt* (2841)?—*Tod*, 3060. The phrase "to cut his way through to Frauenberg" is rather misleading, considering that Frauenberg is on the direct road from Pilsen to Neustadt so that Max could hardly have helped passing through it.—In the "index to persons and places," besides Biblical names, I miss Wismar and Znaim.—In the bibliography, the dates given for Buchheim's edition refer neither to the first nor to the last edition. Beller-mann's *Schillers Dramen* should be marked as a second edition. Of the correspondence with Goethe it would have been better to quote Vollmer's fourth edition of 1881 or the cheap Cotta edition of 1893, which contains several letters not even in Vollmer's last edition. Boxberger's edition in the Collection Speemann is based on Vollmer's far less complete edition of 1870.

In conclusion I take pleasure in giving renewed expression to the feeling of obligation under which Prof. Winkler has placed us by what he has done for the critical study of *Wallenstein* on the part of both students and teachers. The preceding suggestions, as a partial liquidation of my individual obligation, are offered in the hope that they may prove of benefit to the editor in the eventual revision of his work and to other scholars in the preparation of subsequent editions.

II.

As compared with the first edition of 1894, Prof. Carruth's second edition exhibits a sufficient amount of change and revision to justify a few additional remarks.

In the introduction there is some expansion in "the list of persons" (*Kammerfrau*, no reference; *König*; *Liechtenstein*; on p. lxxxix, l. 8, "*Picc. 619*," instead of 680), in the remarks on "the text" (the wording suggests that the Rues manuscript contained a complete text), and in the chapter on "bibliographical suggestions" which, however, is not particularly accurate now (Ranke, 4th. ed. 1882, instead of 4th. ed. 1880, or 5th. ed. 1895; Liliencron, instead of Liliencron; Gödeke 1867, instead of Goedeke, 1867-76; Bellermann, 1891, instead of 1888-91, 2nd. ed. 1898; Friedrich, instead of Fraedrich. Accuracy is the soul of bibliography!). A list of "subjects for themes" has been newly added. Generally, however, the introduction is practically unchanged, as indeed it did not call for any considerable changes.

The principal labor of revision the editor has bestowed upon the text and notes. The former is now as excellent, as before it was unsatisfactory. The type is large and clear, and numerous "Stichproben" proved it to be practically free from inaccuracies (Prol., l. 111, "er" should be spaced; l. 120, read "mit *einem* Mal," cf. *Picc.*, l. 2642, where, however, the spacing is wrong; *Tod*, l. 2194, read "meiste"). As to the notes, there has been a considerable amount of revision of the old material, although not every inaccuracy of the first edition has been removed (Brieg, for example, with its twenty thousand inhabitants is still 'a small town,' while Gitschin with its less than ten thousand is 'a large city'). On the whole, however, the revision and expansion seem to have been done with considerable care. The new edition contains about sixty-nine pages of notes as against the forty-seven pages of the first. This increase is commendable not only from a scholarly, but also from a pedagogical standpoint. For sixty-nine fairly open pages of notes should not be liable to the charge of "over-editing" in case of a text of seven thousand six hundred lines, that is, a text about four times as long as *Hermann und*

Dorothea, twice as long as *Nathan*, and by one-half longer than the *First Part of Faust*.

Prof. Carruth's second edition, in many ways, is a great improvement on the first. In its present form the book will well answer the needs of all who do not intend to study the drama as extensively and critically as those whom Dr. Breul and Prof. Winkler have had in mind in the preparation of their editions.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

University of Wisconsin.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Huit contes choisis par Guy de Maupassant.

Selected and edited with notes by ELIZABETH M. WHITE, Teacher of French, English High School, Worcester, Mass. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1900. vii, 94 pp. With portrait.

Dix contes modernes des meilleurs auteurs du jour. Edited by H. A. POTTER, A. B.,

Master of Modern Languages in the Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y. With notes and English paraphrases for retranslation. Boston: Ginn & Company, 1900. iv, 95 pp.

COLLECTIONS of *contes* still commend themselves, it would seem, to most teachers of French. During the last decade a goodly number of these editions have been offered us, and not a few of them have proved most attractive and satisfactory aids in the earlier courses of our college schedules. The two volumes to be noticed here have points of merit which render them fully as valuable as many that have come before, and they are thus to be cordially welcomed and added to our available material for effective work.

Of the *Huit contes choisis* by Maupassant it may be said, first, that it is a well printed and handy little book which adapts itself excellently to second-year work. The collection is—as the editor remarks in a brief, but pointed and adequate introduction—not intended for elementary classes, and accordingly but few notes are inserted. Those which are given, however, are, for the most part, peculiarly appropriate, especially so in case of a few words of possibly doubtful import, which, if the student were left to himself, might receive an unfortunate interpretation. Two similar cases

where no aid is given, and which also (as it seems to the present reviewer, after having just used the book with a class of second-year students) might well have received attention in the notes are: p. 61, ll. 10-11, "Quelque enfant d'amour dont la pauvre mère, etc.," and p. 71, l. 13, "Il est ce qu'on appelle, en souriant, un noceur." In the annotation upon the word "Yvetot" the insertion of the first six lines of Béranger's poem appears unnecessary.

The eight stories of the edition are well chosen in that they offer good examples of the peculiar power and temper of the author. The editor's own words upon the qualities of Maupassant's tales are so pertinent that they may be quoted in this connection. She says:

"In Maupassant's short stories, no word is wasted, no incident unnecessary; they have interest, color, the bustle of life, the charm of movement, but leave an impression of sadness."

Sad, indeed, they do tend to be; and, as we know, it is very hard for French naturalism to be gay, or even cheerful. It may be added that these stories often leave not only an impression of sadness, but a feeling of dissatisfaction, almost of disaffection toward the author, as well. It is disappointing to have our interest aroused, and to be carried on willingly through an ingeniously contrived tale, only to have the writer pull up suddenly at the end in an unrelenting and pitiless fashion which chills our enthusiasm and deadens our sympathy. Maupassant is powerful, but cold, and we can not but feel that, had he only now and then more of the genial Daudet spirit, we could enjoy him much more unreservedly. Of the eight stories selected, six have an unsatisfactory, pathetic, or tragic close. The editor begins her collection with *la Parure*, one of the first of the author's *contes* to become known in this country, one which has been made to do considerable service in textbooks, and which has attained a success that the reviewer, for one, considers ill-deserved. That the unhappy experiences of 1870-71 have suggested fruitful themes to writers of *contes*, to Maupassant as well as to Daudet and others, is illustrated here in *Deux amis*, a cleverly told tale with a chilling conclusion. The author's native Normandy with its shrewd and artful peasants furnishes the setting for *la*

Ficelle, an excellent piece of writing, and enjoyable till we reach the last few lines. *Le Bonheur*, "a simple story of true love," and perhaps the most attractive one of the collection, takes us to Corsica, where the wild scenery affords an opportunity for an artistic bit of description, a feature which always adds to the beauty of a *conte*. The edition has no table of contents, a convenience, no matter how brief the volume.

The ten *contes* brought together by Mr. Potter are new, and, as a whole, quite interesting. A number of them are cheerful in tone and do not terminate unhappily, which is a good thing. The reviewer believes decidedly in cheerful stories for the classroom, and has always remembered the impression made upon him a few years ago, when, while using in class a certain volume of *contes*, a student came up at the close of the hour and asked if all French stories were as sad as those which were then being read. The *contes* of the present collection are adapted, according to the statement of the editor, to first-year students in the higher institutions. The book has been used recently in this university in an elementary course, and, in the opinion of the instructor in charge, the stories as a whole were found rather too difficult for first-year work. At least it is evident that some of them contain unusual terms and colloquialisms quite beyond the range of the first-year student, and upon which no help is given in the notes. For example, in the *conte* entitled *Pour le ruban* the phrases "A la vôtre, messieurs!" (p. 62, l. 12), and "et lui donna du 'Monsieur' gros comme le bras" (p. 63, ll. 30-31), which are perhaps over the heads of even second-year college students, remain unexplained. It should be added, however, that a good many expressions of this sort do receive satisfactory comment in the notes.

Of the authors who are drawn upon for Mr. Potter's edition, the best known are the Daudet brothers and Guy de Maupassant. From the last writer is taken *l'Aventure de Walter Schnaffs*, perhaps the best story of the editor's volume, and certainly—in its brightness and humor, its entertaining vein of light satire, and its pleasant ending—one of the most agreeable that Maupassant has written, and a welcome

contrast to his many sombre tales. It takes us back again to the time of the Franco-Prussian war, and is another illustration of the willingness of French short-story writers to revert to the events of that period, which furnish either the theme or the background for six of the editor's ten *contes*. The English paraphrases of the French text for retranslation, which are given at the end of the volume, are a commendable feature. They are well planned and should add materially to the usefulness of the book.

B. L. BOWEN.

Ohio State University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Henri de Kleist. Sa Vie et ses Œuvres. Thèse Présentée à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris par R. BONAFOUS. Paris, 1894.

WHILE gathering the bibliography of Heinrich von Kleist, I was struck by the absence of any adequate review of the book of R. Bonafous. This detailed treatment by a foreign scholar, of a poet who is attracting so much attention in his own country, seems to deserve some notice. Even at so late a date, therefore, an analysis of the work may not be without value.

Bonafous' book contains four hundred and twenty-two pages, of which one hundred and seventy-three are devoted to a description of Kleist's life, the other two hundred and forty-nine to a careful analysis of his work. An introductory chapter is devoted to a bibliography up to 1894, omitting all mention of special researches, which are inserted as foot-notes later on. To Bonafous' list might be added: Wolfgang Schmidt, *Von und über H. v. K.*, Berlin, 1890; Karl Biltz, *Zum Gedächtnis H. v. Kleist's*, Potsdam, 1871; also two works by foreigners, which show Kleist from a new and interesting point of view: S. Friedmann, *Enrico di Kleist*, Milano, 1893; J. Le Fèvre-Deumier, *Célebres Allemands*, Paris, 1892.

The general plan of the book is to show Kleist in relation to the great literary and political movements of his time. We cannot feel that this effort has been crowned with entire success. The best description is that of Berlin (pp. 32 and 115). But, though Bonafous draws a vivid picture of the literary war waged here in 1800, he fails to make clear Kleist's

position in regard to the contending elements. He falls short in like manner in the chapter pertaining to Kleist's visit in Weimar (p. 99), by neglecting to give an adequate idea of the contrast which the immature young enthusiast presented to the calm self-control of the literary people whom he met here. This is the more important, since Bonafous shows a misapprehension of the situation when he attributes Goethe's unfavorable impression to *une jalousie secrète* (p. 102).

The catalogue of Wieland's works (p. 103) is inadequate, if the author desires to determine the older poet's position in literature at the time of his meeting with Kleist, and gratuitous if he takes the knowledge of that position for granted on the part of the reader. The tracing of the awakening interest in patriotism on the part of the Romantic school on page 146 is excellent in itself, but needlessly repeated on page 278.

The paragraphs devoted to the development of the German novel (p. 369) and the German comedy (p. 392) are somewhat shallow. They might well have gone into a short analysis of the characteristic features developed at this time, thus giving a background on which to throw into relief Kleist's contributions.

When naming over the various periodicals extant at the time of the *Phæbus*, in 1808 (p. 135), it would have been well to speak of the spirit of investigation and propagation of knowledge which gave rise to the great increase of periodical literature at the beginning of the century, and to show in what measure Kleist took part in this movement.

On the whole, this important portion of the work is marred by a rather superficial treatment and by the author's failing to show how Kleist stands related to the movement which he describes.

The detailed account of his life contained in the first thirteen chapters is clear and sympathetic. Especially well traced is the mental struggle which led to his withdrawal from the army (p. 15 ff.), and the havoc which the study of Kant caused in his ideals (p. 50 ff.). We miss here a comparison of Kleist's disgust with science with the same feeling in other men of his time and temperament—Stolberg, Schlegel, Fouqué. Years later, Lenau, a man

of far less virility than Kleist, expressed views almost identical.

Bonafous devotes six pages to a discussion of various theories concerning the object of the Würzburg journey, omitting, however, Bormann's article in *Unsere Zeit*, 1886, iv.¹ This lengthy treatment of unfruitful theories contrasts painfully with the hurried and inadequate handling of the real results of this journey, which appears in truth as the first great crisis in his life as a poet. Kleist's awakening to the beauties of nature (Biedermann,² *Briefe an seine Braut* pp. 87, 103, 104), the exuberance of his spirits which breaks out in figures sometimes fanciful, sometimes sublime (Biedermann, p. 88), the power of poetic description (Biedermann, pp. 57 and 73) the graphic portrayal of men (Biedermann, p. 73), and finally the increasing confidence in himself and his talents (Biedermann, p. 113) find no adequate consideration.

In treating of the Königsberg period, Bonafous passes over slightly Kleist's first prose composition, *Über die allmähliche Verfertigung der Gedanken beim Reden*, a work important for the development it displays, of his facility in handling his material—his apt use of figures, his complex, carefully built up sentences, and his power of concise description.

The last chapter is devoted to the final year of Kleist's life. Following closely in the path of Brahm and Zolling, it has since been rendered worthless by Steig's investigations (Cf. *Berliner Kämpfe*, 1901).

Of the second part of the book, by far the best chapter is that devoted to an analysis of the *Amphitryon*. This is adequate in every way, particularly in the careful comparison made with the play of Molière.

The least satisfactory is the *Der zerbrochene Krug*, which is classified as a farce. As an observer of human nature and a writer of a Comedy of Manners, Kotzebue is placed above Kleist (pp. 319 to 321). Bonafous considers this comedy *pas une peinture de caractère, une comédie d'intrigue tout au plus* (p. 333). In comparing the work with Zschokke's novel, he fails to bring out Kleist's healthy realism.

¹ These ideas have since been carried out more fully by Morris, *Heinrich von Kleist's Reise nach Würzburg*, Berlin, 1899.

² H. v. Kleist's Breslau u. Leipzig, 1884.

In the chapter on *Robert Guiscard*, the treatment of sources is meagre, compared to Minor's article of the same year (*Euphorion*, vol. i, pp. 564 ff.). Following Brahm, Bonafous is determined to see in the fragment nothing but a drama of destiny, and therefore neglects the human side, failing entirely to see the importance of Abälard, as the representative of the hostile forces raised by his own acts. His treatment of the style of this play is general and superficial. He does not compare it with the current pseudo-Classic plays, nor does he sufficiently appreciate the power and dignity of the language, nor the lucid terseness of the exposition.

Käthchen von Heilbronn he considers *l'imitation pure et simple de Shakespeare* (p. 264), and from its appearance he dates Kleist's formal entrance into the Romantic school. He criticizes the play from a purely rationalistic standpoint, not giving sufficient importance to the fact that it bears all the signs of having originally been intended for a dramatized fairy-tale. In 1805 Kleist had read widely in the French literature of the eighteenth century, as is shown by his translations and his prose tales. Doubtless the *Contes de Fées* did not escape him, nor their weak imitations in Germany. In this play we find every character pertaining to fairy lore: the wicked fairy, the guardian angel, the prince and the disguised princess. The solution, therefore, is in harmony with the general tone. Bonafous institutes no comparison with the various treatments of the Griseldis story in other literatures (Boccaccio, Chrétien de Troyes, Tennyson, Scott, Percy, and others). He seems not to have read the article on *Käthchen* in Friedmann (*Das deutsche Drama d. xix. Jh.*, Milan, 1893, p. 38).

In treating of the scene in the *Prinz von Homburg*, in which the hero shows an abject fear of death, he enters with acumen into the psychology of the hero, showing that a vivid imagination was the cause of the young man's emotion (though he might have drawn the evident parallel with Macbeth). But when he sums up the entire development of the Prince as the change from a *man* to a *soldier*, he seems not to have grasped Kleist's meaning. For it was a mature, self-controlled man that

he developed out of a dreamy, self-willed, passionate boy.

His treatment of the novels is short and perfunctory. He ranks *Kohlhaas* lowest in the first series because of its lack of unity. He does not enter into the peculiar value of Kleist's prose style, its deviation from that of the Romantic school in terseness of form, firmness of characterization and realism of description.

For the sake of completeness, he should have treated the poems and the prose articles of Kleist. He has mentioned some of these, but has not sought to determine their value as exponents of his genius or character. The only one that he has discussed at all is the "Prayer of Zoroaster," of which he says that it contains *rien qui pût satisfaire ou même éveiller la curiosité du lecteur* (p. 162).

Summing up, Bonafous ranks Kleist high in the second order of writers, considering his talent chiefly imitative—first, of Shakespeare, then of the Classics, last, of the Romanticists, with whom he finally classifies him. He seems to have missed the one point of Kleist's peculiar genius which separates him from both the Classic and the Romantic school, with each of whom he shared certain tendencies—his persistent effort to paint life as he saw it, the ugly and grotesque, as well as the harmonious and beautiful. In this he is not a Romanticist, but the progenitor of our modern school, to which, through Grabbe and Hebbel, he handed down his art.

On the whole, this book, without pretending to any originality of material or treatment, gives a good picture of the poet and his milieu. If the author does not rank Kleist as high as Germany is at present inclined to place the long-neglected poet, this may be due to the fact that Kleist is so deeply rooted in his native soil that it is difficult for a foreigner to comprehend the various phases of his complex individuality. By long and excellent translations from the letters and careful abstracts of the works, he has done much to bring Kleist himself before his readers.

A few slight mistakes may be pointed out in closing: His account of the trouble Kleist and Dahlmann met after the battle of Aspern, differs in detail from Schmidt's quotation (Intr. xcix). Bonafous says (p. 151): *Kleist se tira d'affaire en récitant quelque poésies patriotiques de sa composition*. Poor Kleist! His poems never did him such service.

Percy's ballad is "Childe Waters," not "Count Watters" (p. 253)—probably a contamination with Bürger's "Graf Walter."

On page 247 he misses a fine point in Käthchen's character when he says of her consent to return home (iii, 1): *cédant aux prières de ceux qu'elle aime*. She yielded, touched by their sacrifice, not their prayers.

HENRIETTA K. BECKER.

University of Chicago.

FRENCH LITERATURE: PEDAGOGICS.

a. *L'Enfant Espion and Other Stories*, edited with notes and vocabulary by REGINALD R. GOODELL, M. A., University of Maine. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Co., 1901.

b. *Mon Oncle et Mon Curé*, par Jean de la Brète, abridged for class use and edited with notes by T. F. COLIN, Head of French Department, Miss Baldwin's Preparatory School, Bryn Mawr. Boston: Heath and Co., 1901.

c. *A Selection from the Comedies of Molière*, edited with an introduction and notes by EVERETT WARD OLMSTED, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Romance Languages in Cornell University. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901.

d. *Die Reform des Neusprachlichen Unterrichts auf Schule und Universität*. MAX WALTER. Marburg: 1901. 24 pp.

a. MR. GOODELL, now at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, makes his début as an editor with this excellent collection of modern short stories. At the first glance the selections seem too difficult for first year students, for whom the work is manifestly intended, but by full and careful notes and a fairly complete vocabulary, this apparent drawback has been eliminated. On the other hand, the actual interest and beauty of the stories themselves recommend the book immediately to those teachers who are heartily weary of the fairy stories and insipid tales usually found in text-books for beginners. The writer has just finished reading the book with a collegiate class and the results have been highly satisfactory.

The plan of editing followed by Mr. Goodell is to be particularly commended; there is first a brief introduction, consisting of very short

biographical statements concerning the authors of the various stories; namely, Alphonse Daudet, Coppée, de Maupassant, and Mérimée. Then follows the French text with full explanatory notes at the bottom of each page. Thirdly, comes a set of twenty-seven English exercises to be put into French with the aid of the preceding texts; and the book closes with a French-English vocabulary. A most commendable feature in the foot-notes is the almost entire absence of translations, when there seems to be need for aid in this regard the student is referred to the word in the vocabulary under which the expression is to be found. But one error in the statements in the notes has been observed, on p. 44, l. 3, the *Chardin* referred to is undoubtedly the famous painter of still life, *Jean-Baptiste Siméon Chardin*, 1699-1779, and not the merchant and traveler mentioned. We might expect, too, some explanation of *Mauvais-Philibert*, p. 47, l. 10.

The vocabulary, unfortunately, is not up to the high standard set by the rest of the book; one would think that the editor had taken some school dictionary and simply jotted down the first meaning that he found after each of his French words. There are numerous cases where words are used in a special sense in the text without sufficient explanation in the vocabulary, and in addition to this there are several cases where words are entirely omitted. A list of such cases follows, the numbers referring to the page and line where an example may be found: *avant*, before, 14, 2; *venir de*, to have just, 15, 16; *fier*, proud, 17, 3; *bailli*, bailiff, 19, 21; *intérieur*, interior, 34, 18; *fromage d'Italie*, Italian brawn, 38, 5; *se coller en*, to jump into (of dress), 40, 20; *jam-bonneau*, small ham, 40, 27; *kirsch* for *kirsch-wasser*, cherry bounce, 41, 19; *baraque de toile*, show-tent, 42, 2; *buler*, to stumble, 43, 17; *caniche*, poodle not spaniel, 45, 20; *d'occasion*, chance (second-hand), 49, 26; *s'emporter*, to run away (of a horse), 52, 13; *tiens*, the exclamation equivalent to 'look,' 'see,' 54, 18; *telle quelle*, just as it is, 57, 13; *en avoir pour*, to take one (of time), 58, 28-9; *fade*, musty, 61, 10; *dossier*, back (of a chair), 63, 28; *af-folements*, mad attacks, 64, 31; *trancher de*, to border on, 67, 23.

The typography of the text is very clean and the vocabulary is easy to refer to. The follow-

ing misprints occur: *joyeuse* for *joyeuses*, 41, 9; *abandonnant* for *abandonnant*, 44, 11; *étais* for *était*, 68, 33; *dédia* for *délia*, 73, 14; *aurait* for *serait*, 75, 1; *derrère* for *derrrière*, 77, 11; *ordinance* for *ordonnance*, 127, 21; *spadassin* for *spadassin*, 137, 10.

b. Mlle. Colin edits this charming little story to put it in reach of American students preparing for the examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board. The abridgment has been so carefully made that one who had never seen the original would not know that anything had been omitted, and the text has been so well edited that there is really no adverse criticism to be made upon it. The notes are as complete and full as one need ask, scarcely an uncommon idiomatic expression is passed by. In reading over the text but two misprints have been found, *par* for *pas*, p. 9, l. 16, and *chair* for *chaire*, p. 49, l. 10. The little book seems admirably well-adapted for use in secondary schools and in coëducational institutions; there is nothing whatever objectionable in the matter, and the text is bright and interesting and replete with the well-turned, apt phrases which form the great charm of the French language.

c. In his edition of selected plays of Marivaux, Dr. Olmsted has given us a very attractive and handy little text of this author, who is only too little known and read by American students. The three comedies chosen are *le Jeu de l'Amour et du Hasard*, *le Legs*, and *les Fausses Confidences*, which, while not wholly representative of the various sides of Marivaux' dramatic genius, yet, as the editor states, are considered the most popular of his dramas, and have the distinction of being entirely free from the dialect forms which make other of the plays unsuitable for college reading.

The text of the comedies is preceded by an extensive introduction, of sixty-nine pages, in which is narrated the life of Marivaux, his trials and successes as an author, as a member of the Academy, and as a frequenter of the literary salons so famous in his day. There is further an analysis of several of the plays and a classification of the whole body of the author's drama into a six-fold scheme. At the end of the introduction (pp. lxxxii-xc) is a chronological list of all the writings of Marivaux, and a bibliographical note. The introduction is fairly complete and contains the in-

formation needed by the reader for a proper appreciation of the plays presented, but the interest of its perusal would be much increased had the author paid closer attention to the principles of English composition. A curious omission occurs on p. lxxx, where, in giving the date of Marivaux' death, the year, 1763, is entirely left out.

For the French text of the three comedies, the editor has wisely adopted the orthography of the Hachette edition of the *Grands Écrivains*, for, as he says, the spelling of the original would be too confusing for the average student. The explanatory notes which follow the French text are excellent, the editor has not only carefully explained all obscure constructions, but has given in full the modern French forms for every eighteenth century phrase which has disappeared from the usage of to-day.

The general appearance of the publication is attractive, the typography is excellent, and the French text is printed in large, clear characters. The following misprints have been noticed: p. lxxxi, the two foot-notes bear the numbers 3 and 4 and are inverted in order; p. lxxxvi, l. 6, *a'un* for *d'un*; p. lxxxviii, l. 13, insert *Études* after *Nouvelles*; p. 49, l. 4, first *te* for *tu*; p. 135, l. 2, *orders* for *ordres*; p. 155, l. 19, *mois* for *mais*; p. 246, l. 5, *appeller* for *appeler*; p. 302, l. 18, the reference to Martial's Epigrams should read *I, xlvii*, instead of *I, i, xlviii*.

d. This pamphlet contains the paper presented by Direktor Max Walter of the *Realgymnasiums Musterschule* in Frankfurt a. M., before the *Congrès international de l'Enseignement des langues vivantes*, held at Paris in July, 1900. Direktor Walter briefly considers the history and spread of the so-called 'New Method' of teaching modern languages. He mentions the opening of the question of reform in modern language teaching by Prof. Viator's article: *Quousque Tandem: Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren!* published in 1882, and the subsequent development of the 'New Method' together with its introduction into the schools of Germany. The chief features of the system are concisely stated; namely, oral drill for learning both the pronunciation and the signification of the forms of the foreign language, reading in the foreign tongue, with oral interpretation therein of difficult passages,

after this, only, comparative study of the grammar of the foreign and native languages, composition in the foreign tongue based on a text in the same language, and finally a thorough study of the literature, history, manners, and customs of the foreign people, and of the geography of their country. Somewhat further on Direktor Walter gives the results of his personal experiences in teaching French and English by the 'New Method'; his students, after finishing the secondary school course, can fully understand the spoken word, can make themselves understood in ordinary conversation and in the speech of everyday life, they can read and explain texts in the foreign tongue or translate them into their own language, they can write from dictation, explain passages read to them but once, or compose original matter in the foreign tongue. The writer further speaks of the greater responsibilities and labor required of the instructor, and the consequent necessity of an increase in the teaching force properly to handle the 'New Method,' but he also mentions the great enthusiasm for the reform shown by the instructors throughout Germany. In conclusion, Direktor Walter expresses the hope that the mutual study of one another's language may tend toward peace and friendship among the nations. The last four pages of the pamphlet are taken up with a note by Prof. Viator, of Marburg, on the progress of the reform movement in Germany, with mention of its especial needs.

MURRAY P. BRUSH.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE LANGUAGE OF SHETLAND.

Det norrøne sprog på Shetland, af JAKOB JAKOBSEN. København, 1897. x+196 pp.

As early as the beginning of the ninth century Shetland was colonized by vikings from Norway. It had already in the last part of the eighth century become a station for vikings on their expeditions to Scotland, the Southern Isles (the Hebrides), and Ireland. When political centralization took place in Norway under Harald Harfagr vast numbers of the younger men of the country emigrated westward, and the Shetlands, which are only a little over two hundred miles from the outlets of the fjords of Hardanger and Sogn, received their share of viking settlers. When Harald

had made secure his rule in Norway he made an expedition to the West, subdued the isles, and made Sigurd, son of Rognvald Möre, Earl of Shetland and Orkney. They remained an earldom attached to Norway for centuries. The language spoken was a dialect of Norse not very different from that spoken in the Faroes and Iceland, which had been settled after 825 and 870 respectively. Politically and commercially, the Shetlands always remained in the closest union with the mother country. The name Hjeltefjorden (the old name for Shetland was Hjaltland), a little fjord running into Bergen harbor, testifies to the frequency of the visits of Shetlanders to Norway. By the Union of Calmar, in 1397, Norway and its dependency Shetland became united with Denmark under Margaret of Denmark. In 1469 King Christian I of Denmark transferred Shetland and the Orkneys to the crown of Scotland as the dowry of Margaret of Denmark upon her marriage with King James III. The great distance between Shetland and Scotland was not favorable to unifying the two. Though Scotch politically now, commercially, linguistically and in every other way they continued to be Norse long afterwards. The Norse language, or "Norn" as called in Shetland, was spoken almost unchanged for two centuries more. Even as late as the beginning of the present century there were those among the older generation, especially on the outlying isles, who could speak the old Shetland-Norse tongue, and the author of *Det norrøne sprog på Shetland* found in 1894 several who remembered some "Norn" words and phrases.

With the financial assistance of the Danish ministry of culture, the author spent two years (1894-95) in Shetland for the purpose of studying the Old Norse elements that still remain in the new Shetland dialect. *Det norrøne sprog på Shetland*, which was publicly defended for the doctorate in the University of Copenhagen, in June, 1896, was printed in Copenhagen in 1897 as an introduction to a larger work which is to contain the results of Dr. Jakobsen's investigations on the dialect of Shetland. The latter is to be in the form of a dictionary of Norn, and will contain some ten thousand words of Norse origin found in the Shetlandic dialect of Scotch. In an introductory chapter of fifteen pages, the history of

Shetland is discussed politically and linguistically. Although King Christian had stipulated that no changes were to be made in the laws and institutions of the islands we find that by the year 1600 the old laws had been replaced by new ones, the former lawthing done away with, and the Shetland peasantry had lost their allodial possessions and these had passed over into the hands of the earls of the islands appointed by the Scottish crown. This condition of affairs was not calculated to strengthen the Shetlander's loyalty to Scotland, but had the opposite effect, that of making them hold so much longer to the old, and to cling so much more firmly to their Norse associations. As late as 1774 George Low in his *Tour thro' Orkney and Shetland*, says:

"Most of their (the Shetlanders') tales are relative to the history of Norway; they seem to know little of the rest of Europe but by name; Norwegian transactions they have at their fingers' ends."

The breaking down of inflections and the introduction of Scotch words from the official language into that of the rest of the population must have begun by the year 1600. Political separation from Norway brought with it linguistic isolation, the power to resist continued Scotch influence became weaker and weaker. After the antipathy to Scotch had been overcome the change from Norn to Scotch became more rapid. Gradually it came to be regarded a sign of culture to be able to use Scotch words. A verse which is said to belong to the middle of the eighteenth century runs

De var gue ti
when sone min guid to Kadaness
han kan ca' rossa mare
han kan ca' big bere
han kan ca' eld fire
han kan ca' klovandi taings.

The author concludes that while influence of the one language upon the other was constantly increasing throughout the seventeenth century, it was not until the eighteenth century that extended changes took place sufficient to finally change the language of the isles during the course of the century from a Norse dialect to a language Scotch in general character. The two islands that seem to have preserved the old speech longest are Foula and Uust, the former on the west, the latter on the north. In 1850 Norn was still spoken in Uust, and somewhat after the middle of the century in Foula.

"The part of the language that first suffered breaking down were the inflectional forms and the grammatical endings, along with which assimilation of consonants became more and more common. Then the particles of the language disappear, conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns, numerals and the common adverbs, likewise those adjectives and verbs in most common use and abstract nouns. Concrete nouns remained longest, especially those that are associated with the daily life and work of the people" (p. 13).

The force of the postpositive definite article was early lost sight of. Examples of this are numerous, for example, *de bjadni* (ON. *bar-nit*), 'the child'; *de ildinn* (ON. *eldrinn*), 'the fire'; *de kroppinn* (ON. *kropprinn*), 'the body.' The author quotes a number of words (p. 101) in which the ON. nominative ending *i* has apparently been preserved. It becomes difficult, however, in such cases to determine in any given case whether we have the real nominative ending or the Scotch diminutive *-ie*, since both are pronounced the same way, and the latter is so common as to be applied to almost any noun, and not always with diminutive force. In, for instance, *bíti*, "en lille skabning af usædvanlig omfang," the ending *may* be the Scotch diminutive. The Scotch diminutive *-ock* is very common in Shetlandic, and has in a great many cases replaced older Norn endings: so *æringr* > *ærek*, *silungr* > *silek*, *visa* > *visick* or *visek*, etc. By analogy with English adjectives in *-ous* a number of Norse adjectives have taken this ending, for example, *ugjövous*, ON. *ugæfr*, 'unfortunate'; *unsondious* (p. 111), ON. *úsýniligr* 'repulsive,' etc. The past and past participle of verbs are regularly Scotch, but *fin*, 'to find,' has retained the Norn past *fan* and past participle *fon*. A large number of Norse idioms and turns of expression are still heard, for example, *to bear aff*, to excuse one's self; *to have jöl*, to keep Christmas; *to mak ill*, to cause trouble, cf. Norwegian *at gjera ilt*; *to say fae onything* (ON. *segja frá*) to tell about anything, etc. The Norn elements are fast disappearing, many words that seem to have been in common use a few decades ago are no longer understood by the younger generation. A large number of words formerly common are now found only as parts of compounds and others again with highly specialized meanings often very different from the original one. ON. *dagr* remains in *dagali*, 'the end of day,' twilight; and ON. *dalr* in *dalamist*, 'dalefog,' etc. ON. *andi*, 'breath,'

is Shetlandic *ändi*, strong odor; ON. *eyðr*, folk, is Shetlandic *lō*, mob, and ON. *granni*, neighbor, has become *grani*, friend. In the same way ON. *bjarttr*, which means "bright" lives in the Shetlandic *a bjart sky*, 'a dark, cloudy sky.' The intercourse between the various islands was at first very limited and thus dialectal differences very easily developed. When Scotch influence became more pronounced it was not always the same words that were replaced by new ones in the various islands, or even in different parts of the same island. Many words continued in use only in certain localities and again the same word developed a variety of meanings according to the locality, all of course more or less closely related to that of the original word.

The Norn elements in Shetlandic are oftentimes so changed and distorted that the Norse word can be recognized with difficulty in the present Norn form. Add to this the great variety of forms a word may take in regions far removed with little or no intercourse between them and the very divergent meanings of entirely a different form of the word in, for instance, Whalsay, Unst, and Dunrossness the problem of collecting words and language elements of Norse origin in the Shetland dialect became an exceedingly difficult one. A prerequisite for such an undertaking could be nothing less than a knowledge of Scotch and Norse in all its stages together with an extended knowledge of the Scandinavian languages and Germanic dialects in general. The author has handled the difficult subject in a manner that leaves almost nothing to be desired. He has carried on his investigations with untiring energy and with a well-nigh remarkable acuteness of observation. His knowledge of Feroese (Mr. Jakobsen is a native of the Feroes), closely related to the Norn dialect, has sometimes assisted him in tracing the etymology of words that offered special difficulty. One special importance that attaches to Mr. Jakobsen's study is that it forms a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Old West Scandinavian. In the large body of Norn words the author has collected having no parallel found in Old Norse or Old Icelandic literature many have been derived from a starred ON. form, the existence of which in ON. times is proved by the Norn word in the Shetland dialect. The author has, however, disregarded the possible presence of Danish

influence in certain cases where the form of the word would suggest it. Danish was the official language of the island from 1397 to 1469. While the period was too short to permit of any considerable Danish influence on the speech of the bulk of the population the possibility of the introduction of some Danish elements cannot be overlooked especially in view of the fact that Danish intercourse with the Shetlands during these seventy-two years seems to have been rather intimate. The word *kjøb* 'recompense,' is certainly nearer to Middle Danish *kjøb* than to ON. *kaup*. And so the Uust word *voker* (as also Feroese *vakur*?) probably come from Danish *vakker*. These words, however, together with two or three for which Danish parallels are cited, and which are probably of Danish origin, only show how slight the influence of Danish on the language of the islands was. Mention has already been made of the distorted form in which many Norn words have come down, and the variety of meanings the same word has taken on in the different isles. ON. *fok*, 'fog,' 'something drifting,' becomes *ffjäg* in western Fetlar and in part of Yell. It is *ffjok* elsewhere in Fetlar, *fog* in Delting, *fog* in Northmavine and Dunrossness, and *ffjog* in "de Herra" in Yell. In Delting and in western Fetlar the word (*fog*, *ffjäg*) means 'foggy clouds.' In Uust *ffjög* means 'mist-like rain or snow,' while in Fetlar (except the western part) *ffjag* means 'everything collected in a loose heap.' The varied development of the vowels is, in the author's opinion (p. 115), due largely to the different stages of Scotch influence in the various cases. A chapter is devoted to the interesting subject of the taboo-names used by the Shetland fishermen. This practice of giving taboo-names is the outgrowth of a superstition that it was unlucky to call some things by their real names at certain times. And so a number of "haf-words" or "lucky words" came into use—words that are intelligible everywhere in the Shetlands—to take the place of the real names of certain things at such times. In time the practice developed until the result was a systematically carried out seaman's language, differing considerably from the ordinary daily speech. A very large number of Norn elements have been preserved in this haf-language otherwise crowded out of the daily speech by Scotch or

English words. Very often they are of a more or less poetic character, figurative designations for the objects they stand for. Usually some prominent characteristic of the thing gave rise to the paraphrastic name. The mast is called *de streng* ('the pole'); the whitefish is called *de hvida* ('the white one'); the flounder is called *de baldin* ('the obstinate one'); the bottom of the sea is called *de dek* (from ON. *dökk*, 'depression'); the sun is called *de foger* ('the beautiful one'); the gun becomes *de smeller* ('the thing that sounds, cracks'), etc. There are left of these "haf" or "lucky-words" in Shetlandic forty-nine terms for the boat and the various parts of a fisherman's outfit, eighty-five for animals, birds and fishes, and eighty-seven for other objects.

In chapter vii the author discusses the phonology of the Norse loan-elements. With the breaking of *e* to *ya*, *ja*, spoken of on page 131, in for example, *yach* from *ek*, *whar an yaar* from Norse *hvor han er*, may be compared a similar process in the dialects of Southern Scotland, discussed by Murray in *The Dialects of the Southern Counties of Scotland*, page 105. In these dialects *ac*, 'oak,' has become *yak*, and English *earth* appears as *yirth*, etc. In the consonant combinations *hj* and *hn*, *h* usually becomes *s*. ON. *hjarl* is in Shetlandic *sjarl*, and the original name of the isles, *Hjaltland*, has become *Shetland*. ON. *hneppa* has become *snep* (*knep* is also heard). *Hw* appears as *hw* or *kw*, rarely *sw*. In eastern and southern Shetland, especially Unst, Yell, and Dunrossness, the sound is *hw*. On the west, especially in Foula, Inarf, and Coningsburg it is *kw*. So ON. *hveppa* becomes *hwop* on the East, but *kwop* on the West, and so on in all words having this consonant combination. In dealing with Norse elements in Shetlandic the question of secondary borrowing through Scotch also presents itself. A large number of Lowland Scotch words in most common use which themselves are of Norse origin have come in from Scotland, but in dealing with Norn elements such words in the Shetlandic dialect must, of course, be classed as Scotch words and not as "Norn." The word *bann* in the expression 'to curse and bann,' the author regards as a Norn word from ON. *banna*. Its immediate source, however, seems to me to be the Scotch *ban*, itself from ON. *banna*. Shetlandic *ban* is then not one of the remnants of

the Old Norn, but a word introduced along with Scotch speech. The word *ber* (*bor*), ON. *byrr*, has also come in from Scotland. In the case of *spör*, 'to court,' we probably have a meaning borrowed from Scotch. *Bigin* in a *begin of hooses* is not a Norn word but the Scotch *biggin*, but this latter is probably from ON. *bygging*. The use of the word *begin* in Shetland shows that this is the source of the word. Shetlandic *begin* is a group of houses built closely together. This meaning the word developed in Scotland. The Norse *bygg(u)ing* always refers to one single building. So *goul* is a later borrowing from Scotch. ON. *gaula* appears in Shetlandic as *göl* (p. 78). The author presents his material in an interesting way, orders his topics well and discusses the various phases of the subject, the nature of the loan-material, and the phonology of loan-words with scholarly thoroughness. The fragments in Norn, however, might better been collected in one place. Barring the few cases in which possible Danish or Scotch influence has been overlooked it would be difficult to take exception to any of the conclusions drawn with regard to the history of Norn words. Mistakes of quantity or ending which might very easily creep in where such a large number of Norse and Icelandic words are cited are exceedingly rare. On page 20 Shetlandic *Goit a taka gamla mana rō* is referred to ON. *gott at taka gamla manna råd*, where *gamla* should, of course, be *gamalla* (Gen. pl.).

A chapter on the exact Norse provenience of the Shetlandic loan-elements would have been welcome. From a comparison of a list of Shetlandic words with Norse dialect words Sophus Bugge concluded that the original settlers of Shetland came from the counties of Lyster and Mandal in southwestern Norway. Dr. Jakobsen emphasizes Agder in southwestern Norway as probably having contributed most toward the Shetland settlements. This conclusion is based on the comparison of a rather small number of Norn words with Norse dialect words as given in Ross's *Norsk Ordbog*. Ross's dictionary, however, is especially complete for the dialects of Agder and Mandal while some of the dialects of western Norway, for instance, are not treated with equal fulness. The Shetlandic words that are common to Agder, and on which Dr. Jakobsen's conclusion is based, then, are nearly all of them common

to Sogn, Hardanger and Telemarken also, though Ross's dialect dictionary fails to show it. Shetlandic *to hwop*, ON. *hveppa* appears according to Ross in Agder and Telemarken, Norway. But the word *kveppa* is as common in Sogn as *kveppe* is in Agder. Shetlandic *jema*, ON. *eimr*, Ross locates in Mandal in the form *eim*. The word also occurs in Telemarken (*æim*) and in Sogn (*aim*); *kuna*, 'wife,' appears as *kaana* in Sogn though not so recorded in Ross; *lönihus* is from ON. **löynihus*. The first element is found in the verb *löyne* in Telemarken, also omitted in Ross; to *öus* is the same as Sogn *æusa*, Telemarken *æuse*, Shetlandic *sjoden*, (ON. *tjern*, 'tarn'), is the Sogn word *tjōddn*. The word also occurs in Telemarken in the form *tjōnn*, (in Shetland also *sjōn*). Shetland *swäit*, Norse *skvetta* Ross locates in Agder and Telemarken. The word is as common in Sogn. The author's conclusions, then, on the question of the dialectal provenience of Norn elements and the locality in Norway from which the emigrants to Shetland came are based on insufficient data, indeed the arguments would seem to be stronger for Sogn and Hardanger than for Agder or Mandal. Such Shetlandic words as *gild*, *munuka*, *maldren*, *sjodeu*, *hent*, *hwop*, *swäit*, *jema* and *ælt* have a peculiar Sogn flavor about them that suggests Sogn origin, on the other hand the word *usjuna* immediately calls up the Telemarken word *utjōn*. It would seem that Mandal, Agder, Sogn, Hardanger, and Telemarken have all contributed their share, Sogn possibly most, something that would seem natural when we bear in mind that vast numbers of vikings sailed out from the Sognefjord. We have, however, no means of knowing what the "Wortvorrath" of these various dialects was in the early viking age. Because a word is common to only two or three of these dialects now we have no right to suppose that was the case in the eighth or the ninth century. The word may have existed in several other dialects in those early times. And finally we have to deal with the question of inter-dialectal loans or the migration of words from one dialect to another, all of which only shows how complicated the task is and how unsatisfactory all conclusions are with regard to the exact source of Norse elements in Scotch if based on the distribution of words in the modern dialects.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Iowa.

CORRESPONDENCE.

ENGLISH POETRY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In E. P. Whipple's criticism of Christopher Marlowe's play of *Dr. Faustus* occurs the following passage:

"The characters of Faustus and Mephistopheles are both conceived with great depth and strength of imagination; and the last scene of the play, exhibiting the agony of supernatural terror in which Faustus awaits the coming of the fiend who has bought and paid for his soul, is not without touches of sublimity. There is one line, especially, which is loaded with meaning and suggestiveness,—that in which harboring for a moment the possibility of salvation amid the gathering horrors of his doom, Faustus exclaims:

'See, see where Christ's blood streams in the firmament!'"

The comment on this line by Whipple is the only attempt at its interpretation that I have found among Marlowe's editors and critics, and this gives us no key to the meaning of the figure 'Christ's blood streams in the firmament.' Saintsbury quotes the line as 'one of those phrases and passages of blinding and dazzling poetry that flash out in Marlowe,' and its imaginative quality has been noted by other critics. I have been so fortunate as to find an instructive parallel in the Old English poem, Cynewulf's *Christ*. In the 'Doomsday,' Pt. iii, of the *Christ*, ll. 1082 seq. of Mr. Whitman's translation is the following:

"Then (that is, at the Judgment Day) shall sinful men, sad at heart, behold the greatest affliction, Not for their behoof shall the cross of our Lord, brightest of beacons, stand before all nations, wet with the pure blood of heaven's King, stained with his gore, shining brightly over the vast creation. Shadows shall be put to flight when the resplendent cross shall blaze upon all peoples. . . . For all this will he rigorously exact recompense when the red rood shall shine brightly over all in the sun's stead. Fearfully and sorrowfully shall they look thereon, those black workers of iniquity, fordone by sin. . . ."

This apparition of the blood-stained cross shining in the heavens at the Judgment is accounted for by Prof. Cook in his edition of Cynewulf's *Christ* through numerous parallel passages drawn from early Christian writers. The vision of Constantine recorded by Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine*, is noted as one of the original sources of the conception, and

from there it is traced into the services of the Church. I include one note which is of especial interest in this relation:

'As affording indications that the Church, recognized a connection between the vision of Constantine and the Sign of the Son of Man, we may refer to the Feast of the Invention of the Cross (3 May) and of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 September). At the First Vespers of these Feasts, the Hymn is 'Vexilla Regis prodeunt' and the Antiphon of the Magnificat begins: 'O Crux splendidior cunctis astris.'"

At the Second Nocturn of the Invention is a direct reference to the vision of Constantine, and

"at the end of the Third Lesson occurs the Respond: 'Hoc signum crucis erit in caelo cum Dominus ad judicandum venerit; tunc manifesta erunt abscondita cordis nostri' (cf. 1036-8, 1045-1056). The beginning of this is likewise used at the First Vespers, the Third Nocturn, Terce, and Nones of the Invention, and at First Vespers, First, Second, and Third Nocturns, Terce and Nones of the Exaltation . . . Stories of the apparition of a cross in the heavens (see Brewer, *Dictionary of Miracles*, pp. 72-3, 282, 314), were related by Cyril of Jerusalem (A. D. 386), by Gregory Nazianzen concerning the Emperor Julian, by others concerning St. Ouen (646), etc. Cf. Alban Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, September 14, note."

This being established, we may turn again to the line in question in Marlowe, and considering with it the well-known adaptation from Scripture which follows:

"Mountain and hills come, come and fall on me,
And hide me from the heavy wrath of God!"

there seems little doubt that to Faustus in his agony there started up this flaming Middle-Age image of the cross set in the firmament, whose light at the last day should make manifest the secrets of men's hearts. Certainly Marlowe, who was well educated, being a graduate of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, might have acquired his knowledge of the tradition from any of a variety of sources,—either from the early Christian writings, or from contemporary ecclesiastical and literary sources. Also, it is noteworthy that Marlowe was an active atheist, and on this account he might have been fully acquainted with the history and traditions of the church which he attacked.

HERBERT B. BROUGHAM.

Yale University.

SCOTCH *tyne*.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In an article on *Some Derived Meanings*, MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xvi, No. 1 (1901), Francis A. Wood cites Sco. *tine*, to lose, along with OE. *tēon*, injury, suffering, insult, verb *tienan*, to irritate, revile. Inasmuch as Sco. *tyne* (so usually written) is not from OE. *tienan*, the example is ill-chosen and cannot be used to illustrate derivational meanings in the English group. The form of ME. *tine*, to lose, which I believe occurs exclusively in Midland and Northern texts, M. Sco. *tyne*, Northern dialectal *tine*, id., shows *i*-mutation of Teutonic *eu*. So also West Saxon *tienan* (<*tēonian*), cf. *tēona*, sb., injury, and ON. *týna*, to lose, (primary meaning), with which cf., *tjón* (older *tēon*) loss, destruction. As *i*-mutation of *eo* (Teutonic *eu*) did not take place in Anglian, see Sievers-Cook, *Grammar of Old English*, § 159.4, the corresponding Anglian verb would be *tēona(n)* which would not have resulted in Northern English, M. Sco. *tine*, *tyne*. This form is, however, easily accounted for by accepting Norse loan. The wide divergence in meaning between the OE. and the Sco. word is thus accounted for. The Scandinavian origin of the NE.-Sco. word has already been claimed by Wall, *Scandinavian Elements in English Dialects*, Anglia xx, p. 125, and by myself in *Scandinavian Influence on Southern Lowland Scotch*, Macmillan, 1900, p. 67. For a discussion of ME. *tine*, and other words of this class see pp. 116-117 of Eric Björkman's scholarly treatise on *Scandinavian Loan-words in Middle English*, Upsala, 1900.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Iowa.

ENGLISH AND GERMAN PRONUNCIATION.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—In the interests of phonetic science, I should like to make a few observations on certain statements in the January number of MOD. LANG. NOTES, by Mr. A. B. Lyman.

It is a well known fact that, in native German words, the digraph *ch* may represent two quite distinct sounds, about as different from one another as are English *z* and *ð* (as in the word *those*). Mr. Lyman's article ignores this, apparently assuming that the sound written *ç* in the International Alphabet is the only one represented by German *ch*.

The definition of this sound as an "aspirated iotization" is rather peculiar. English *þ* is commonly aspirated; the final consonant of the Russian word meaning 'seven' is an iotization (of *m*); yet neither of these has any especial similarity to the sound in question.

As to *Hugh*, *hew*, *humane*, it may be true that some persons begin them with *ç*, or a very similar sound, but this can hardly be considered the common pronunciation. The treatment of *here*, *hear*, I do not profess to understand; but there is apparently something wrong about it. Perhaps *chehr* was intended for *chihr*; if so, is it safe to assume that the English letter *h* before the sound *i* (German *i*, our so-called "long *e*") is pronounced *ç* by any considerable number of English-speakers?

Without entering upon a discussion of the popular belief that the sounds of one language can be represented in the orthography of another, I should like to ask if there is any good authority for pronouncing the letters *b* and *d* in *Körbchen*, *Mädchen* as *b*, *d*? There seems to be a general consensus of opinion among phonetists that they are pronounced as *p* and *t* respectively.

EDWIN H. TUTTLE.

New Haven, Conn.

ANGLO-SAXON GLOSSES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The *Century Dictionary* gives as second meaning of the noun *lead* 'a following,' quoting from Child's *Ballads*, v, 108,

Take fyve of the best knyghtes

That be in your *lede*.

Lead in this sense is already on record in the oldest English glossaries. We find Aldhelm's (*Epist. ad Eahfridum*, Giles p. 94, 27) *catasta* glossed by *geleod* in the *Erfurt*, which appears as *geloed* in the *Corpus* and as *gloed* in the *Epinal*. The latter has given rise to the assumption of an A.-S. *glôed* 'instrument of torture' (so still says Kluge in the glossary to his *Angels. Lesebuch*), but a glance at *WW*, 201, 16 *catasta* . . . *uel geleod quadrupalium* shows that reference is had to the string of hounds mentioned in the above Aldhelm passage. A.-S. *óst* is according to Kluge and Sweet on record only in the sense of 'knot, knob,' but in the *Old English Martyrology*, ed. G. Herzfeld, p. 48, 25, *ostum* undoubtedly answers to German *Ästen*. In the same book, p. 92, 1, there occurs *cristnere* as epithet of *Petr*.

The word is absent from Sweet's *Dictionary*, as is *clæsnungdrenc*, *ibid.* p. 72, 27; *woruld-fægernes*, *ibid.* p. 34, 6; the anglicized (form of Latin *fullo*) *fulwa* (*pæt* is *webwyrhta*), *ibid.* p. 26, 26 *widsæ*, *ibid.* p. 24, 22; *hanasang*, *ibid.* p. 4, 16. *Fréon* in the sense of 'love' is according to Sweet only poetical; but in the nearly related sense of 'caress' it is twice on record in prose, once in the glosses and another time in the *Martyrology* p. 216, 29. The gloss in question is, to be sure, absent also from Sweet's edition of the *Epinal-Erfurt-Corpus* glossaries in his *OET*. We read in the *Corp.* *Gloss. Lat.* v, 373, 8 *mulcet friad=friad* (*Erfurt*). *Epinal* concurs with *Corpus* in exhibiting *friad*. I was the first to draw attention to the A.-S. character of the interpretation in the *American Journal of Germanic Philology*, but I erred in trying to connect it with Scotch *fleece*.

A puzzling passage at first sight is the A.-S. paraphrase of Thorpe's *Ps.* 68, 3, *byð me æt þam earon/eaƿon wiðgangen*, rendering Latin *defecerunt oculi mei*. The psalmist is apparently made to say that eye-sight has gone from him because of his 'ears.' But, somebody may object, there is no necessity for charging the paraphraser with such an evident absurdity. Do you not know that there is an A.-S. *ear* 'sea,' and that consequently it is possible to translate 'because of the salty floods eyesight has gone from me?' I would immediately accept this explanation, were it not for the *gehhero* glossing *lacrimas* in the *Durh. Rit.* p. 40, § 8, l. 2. That *gehhero* is a phonetic change of *tehhero*, as Bouterwek (*Introduct.* to the *North. Gosp.* p. L.) would have us believe, is of course out of the question. The initial *g* can be nothing else but the short form of the prefix *ge-*, and *ehher* may answer to Skt. *açrām* as *tehher* presupposes a not recorded **daçrām* (cf. Noreen, *Urg. Lautl.* p. 209). The corresponding common A.-S. form of *ehher* 'tear' would then be represented by the *ear* 'tear' we meet with in the above passage of Thorpe's *Psalter*. If I be correct in this assumption, then an *ear* 'tear' will have to appear by the side of *ear* 'sea' in our A.-S. Dictionaries.

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Hartford, Conn.

1 Kluge, *Etym. Wtb.* sub *Zähre* gives *açru*-**daçru* as respective Skt. forms.

SUMMER SESSION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF GRENOBLE.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—The idea of establishing vacation courses for teachers of French in foreign countries was proposed to the rector of the University of Grenoble four years ago by an American who was spending his summer there, and Americans have ever since been liberal patronizers of the enterprise. The report for the session of 1901 shows in a total enrolment of two hundred and eighty-four, no less than twenty-six from the United States, which number is surpassed by only one other nationality.

Grenoble is but one of four French Universities which offer summer classes for foreigners, but in some respects the organization of the work there is unique and worthy the consideration of teachers of French who seek to combine study with summer vacation. Its location, at the base of the French Alps, has its advantages for summer residence. The session comprises four consecutive months, from July to October inclusive, but the work of each month is independent of that of the others so that the student may arrange his stay to suit the length of his vacation.

The courses are varied. Besides such classes in the language and literature as might be expected, there are lectures on French history, geography, law, economics, art and sociology, which furnish a vivid acquaintance with French business and social life, a knowledge which is scarcely less important to a teacher of French literature than the language itself.

The University of Grenoble is also unique in that it offers during the scholastic year supplementary courses in the French language for foreign students regularly matriculated. During the year 1900-1901 five Americans were enrolled for these courses.

EDGAR EWING BRANDON.

Paris, France.

I AND we.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—From the reference to Prof. E. T. Owen's work, *A Revision of the Pronoun*, in the leading article of the last issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES, it would naturally be inferred that Prof. Owen was totally unaware at the

time of its publication that any one before him had held that *we* is not the plural of *I*. As a matter of fact, he distinctly disclaims priority of "discovery." On p. 120 of his work, where this subject is discussed, he says: "Since reaching this view, I find it adopted by Kern and others."

LUCY M. GAY.

University of Wisconsin.

BRIEF MENTION.

In 1898-1900 a "Catalogue of the Dante Collection presented by Willard Fiske" to the Cornell University Library (Ithaca, N. Y.) was published. This catalogue consists of two royal octave volumes, of six hundred and six double-column pages, with a Subject Index, and is one of the most important aids ever issued for the student of Dante literature. The Compiler of this catalogue, Theodore Wesley Koch, again places indications of valuable material before the special American worker in Dante science in "A List of Danteana in American Libraries, supplementing the Catalogue of the Cornell Collection."¹ We have, here, twenty public libraries of the United States and one private library (that of Prof. Charles Eliot Norton of Cambridge) represented, with the text of sixty-one pages, followed by an Index of five pages. To facilitate ready reference, this supplementary collection is divided into two parts: Part i, "Dante's Works" covering the *Divina Commedia* (texts, translations, etc.), and the *Opere Minori*; Part ii, "Works on Dante," which naturally constitute the bulk of the collection. It is most gratifying to note among the special Italian texts the unique and well-known copy of 1472 (Mantua), belonging to the Lenox library of New York.

"No books exist," says the Quaritch *General Catalogue* for 1874, "with the imprint of Mantua of an earlier date than this—an undeniable fact, although the title of *Editio Princeps* of Dante may be claimed with equal right for the editions printed in the same year at Jesi and Foligno. It is, however, the rarest of the three. . . ."

Let us hope that Mr. Koch may soon be able to give us the second of his promised lists under the suggested title: "Additional list of Danteana supplementing the Cornell Col-

¹ Ginn and Company (for the Dante Society), 1901. Octavo, pp. 67.

lection; being titles gleaned from European libraries."

Emil Koeppel contributes the eighty-ninth number of *Quellen und Forschungen* (Strassburg, K. J. Truebner, 1901), and entitles it *Spelling-Pronunciations* (cf. *Englische-Studien*, xxx, 120). Let phonetic law and analogy work as they may, there is in the graphic appearance of the word, in its spelling, an influence that produces permanent changes in speech. The linguist has every right to insist on laws, but he is constantly learning to dispute less about the 'invariability' of one or two obvious ones, and to admit into the processes of language-change many new laws, or many old ones to places of new importance. 'Social conventions,' we are now told with a fresh emphasis, 'may influence the phonetic character of speech' (Wundt, Oertel), and what limit may be set to such conventions! Not wholly unrelated to them is the fashion to pronounce occasionally as one spells. The greatest wonder of all is that even an occasional lapse into rectitude is possible in a language that has allowed an uncompromising estrangement between the spoken and the written word. If, after having learned to spell the English language, there is still left a trace of an active impulse to reason from sound to symbol, does it not argue the persistence of the age of miracles? But this trace of an elastic power does not only survive in sporadic manifestations, but it is also supposed by some thoughtful people to furnish the best means for the inauguration of an orthographic reformation. 'Let us stop quarrelling with our spelling,' they would say, 'and let us begin to pronounce as we spell.' The suggestion has value, for this rule has always to some extent been observed; Koeppel would otherwise not have had occasion to write his book. But, on the other hand, Koeppel's pages show the inevitable restrictions of the rule. Only in the case of a short list of words could the 'common consent of mankind,' be gained to favor 'spelling-pronunciation;' the list would hardly pass the present limits of permissible variations in pronunciation (either standard or provincial). Many common words have come to be pronounced in conformity to the letter, such as *theatre, language, banquet, corps, fault*; and the history of such facts is here carefully presented. This history is instructively interest-

ing and surprisingly entertaining, but it should not be read by the pedantic teacher lest he may believe that he has found vindication of his teaching such atrocities as the 'spelling-pronunciation' of *soldier, literature, says, mountain*, and (*procul o, procul!*) *England, English*.

Milton's Prosody, by Robert Bridges, and *Classical Metres in English Verse*, by W. J. Stone, are brought together, in revised form, into one book (Oxford, 1901). The first of these essays, comprising a detailed exposition of the prosody of the *Paradise Lost* and of *Samson Agonistes*, has in the past eight or nine years become widely known. Its last revision has affected only minor matters of arrangement and expression, but there has been added to the eight appendices a ninth, giving "an analysis of stress-prosody and a chapter on the structure of the English hexameter," and here, the author assures us, are to be found *nova praecepta*. There is indeed a new foot-name, *brilannic*, and there is also a new appeal to 'grammar,' from which one might expect increased precision of method; Mr. Bridges, however, continues to maintain his characteristic indefiniteness of doctrine, which is so well shown in his second chapter in the very argument by which the validity of the treatise must stand or fall. Mr. Bridges knows something of the power of the argument from historic grammar, and he always writes in an attractive style; one must therefore continue to regret that his essay is marred by errors that are fundamental. He has overlooked those phenomena of accentuation that have at all times determined the rhythm of our verse, and inadvertently he has postulated differences between 'syllabic' and 'accentual' verse, which may be set aside by the simple denial of the evidence at any time of syllabic verse in English. This essay has recently been thoroughly considered by Dr. G. D. Brown, in his dissertation entitled *Syllabification and Accent in the Paradise Lost* (Baltimore, 1901).

The purpose of Mr. Stone's essay is to explore the possibility of introducing Classical rules of prosody into English. "I know too," it is confessed, "that my thesis is likely to become distasteful to many, the further it proceeds to its logical conclusion" (p. 118).

Mr. Stone's death has left Mr. Bridges to commend the essay, not so much for its direct applicability (Mr. Bridges is not an areopagite) as for its discriminating analysis of the elements of rhythm.

Attention should be called, here, to two works: *Voyages en Zigzag par Rudolphe Töpffer*, edited by Ascott R. Hope, Holt & Co., and *Balzac's Cinq Scènes de la Comédie Humaine*, edited by B. W. Wells, Heath & Co. The first is interesting from the fact that we have had nothing of Töpffer's vast amount of interesting writings in a convenient form. This edition gives us one hundred pages, closely printed, of choice selections from his travels, with very satisfactory notes and a vocabulary, which makes a most useful book for the second semester of the first year, or the first semester of the second year. These selections are especially convenient for conversational purposes and rapid reading.

The second book contains five happily selected short stories of Balzac; they seem to be especially well chosen, for they contain an *ensemble-view* of Balzac and his philosophy of life. They show clearly that the editor is familiar with Balzac, the man and the writer. The value of both books, however, lies more in the selection of material than in the work found in the notes or the introduction.

PERSONAL.

PROFESSOR HERMANN COLLITZ.

Our readers will please notice that Professor Hermann Collitz, of Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, has assumed the editorship of the Germanic Department of MOD. LANG. NOTES. All material, such as articles, new books, and correspondence, relating to the special Germanic field, or to Comparative Grammar of the Teutonic languages, should be sent directly to Professor Collitz, not to the Managing Editor of the NOTES. This suggestion should be followed, particularly for contributions and new books, as both delay and additional expense are thus avoided in handling the material sent in for publication and for review.